arXiv:1410.6118v3 [cs.LO] 8 Jun 2016

ChoiceGAPs: Competitive Diffusion as a Massive Multi-Player Game in Social Networks

Edoardo Serra, Francesca Spezzano and V.S. Subrahmanian

We consider the problem of modeling competitive diffusion in real world social networks via the notion of ChoiceGAPs which combine choice logic programs due to Saccà and Zaniolo and Generalized Annotated Programs due to Kifer and Subrahmanian. We assume that each vertex in a social network is a player in a multi-player game (with a huge number of players) — the choice part of the ChoiceGAPs describe utilities of players for acting in various ways based on utilities of their neighbors in those and other situations. We define multi-player Nash equilibrium for such programs — but because they require some conditions that are hard to satisfy in the real world, we introduce a new model-theoretic concept of strong equilibrium. We show that stable equilibria can capture all Nash equilibria. We prove a host of complexity (intractability) results for checking existence of strong equilibria (as well as related counting complexity results), together with algorithms to find them. We then identify a class of ChoiceGAPs for which stable equilibria can be polynomially computed. We develop algorithms for computing these equilibria under various restrictions. We come up with the important concept of an estimation query which can compute quantities w.r.t. a given strong equilibrium, and approximate ranges of values (answers) across the space of strong equilibria. Even though we show that computing range answers to estimation queries exactly is intractable, we are able to identify classes of estimation queries that can be answered in polynomial time. We report on experiments we conducted with a real-world FaceBook data set surrounding the 2013 Italian election showing that our algorithms have good predictive accuracy with an Area Under a ROC Curve that, on average, is over 0.76.

I.2.4 [**Knowledge Representation Formalisms and Methods**]: Representations (procedural and rule-based); I.2.3 [**Deduction and Theorem Proving**]: Logic Programming

General Terms: Theory

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Social network, competitive diffusion, generalized annotated programs, game theory

1. INTRODUCTION

The need to understand and predict the results of diffusion in social networks has taken on great importance in recent years. Most past work assumes a non-competitive scenario in which we model diffusion of one phenomenon at a time. However, in the real world, multiple competing phenomena are often diffusing concurrently. For instance, the "likes" for a political candidate A and a competing candidate B might be mutually exclusive — a person may support at most one of them. Likewise, two competing marketing campaigns, one each for the iOS and

Edoardo Serra, Francesca Spezzano and V.S. Subrahmanian are with the University of Maryland Institute for Advanced Computer Studies (UMIACS), College Park, MD 20742, USA.
Permission to make digital/hard copy of all or part of this material without fee for personal or classroom use provided that the copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage, the ACM copyright/server notice, the title of the publication, and its date appear, and notice is given that copying is by permission of the ACM, Inc. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers, or to redistribute to lists requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.
© 2016 ACM 0000-0000/2016/0000-0001 $5.00

Android platforms, may garner "likes" from supporters of each but it is unlikely that they will both get "likes" from the same person. In a similar vein, various "issues" may have supporters - for instance, in the US, there are "pro" and "anti" abortion supporters, "pro" and "anti" immigration supporters, "pro" and "anti" Obamacare (Mr. Obama's 2014 health care law) supporters, and so forth. In all these cases, people typically choose at most one of these *positions.*

In this paper, we present the ChoiceGAP framework using which we can model competing diffusive processes via a mix of generalized annotated programs (GAPs) due to Kifer and Subrahmanian [Kifer and Subrahmanian 1992] and Choice Logic Programs proposed by Saccà and Zaniolo [Saccà and Zaniolo 1990]. The use of GAPs to model diffusion processes was already proposed in [Shakarian et al. 2013; Broecheler et al. 2010] — there, the authors show how many well-known diffusion models can be expressed as GAPs.[1] [Shakarian et al. 2013] assumes only one diffusive process is occurring at a time and that there is no competition going on. [Broecheler et al. 2010] presents first steps toward modeling competitive diffusion but do so by identifying one solution of a convex set of nonlinear (conic) constraints. They do not present complexity results, nor do they present accuracy results based on real data. Moreover, their framework usually takes hours to compute.

When members of a social network can choose at most one of n different competing positions, we first use n different diffusion models, each capturing how support for each of the competing positions spreads through a social network. Each vertex in the social network can be considered to be a player in the game with one of $n+1$ choices to make. He can either choose one of the competing positions or he can choose none – he can never choose more than one. The players' utility (for a given course of action, e.g. being pro-Obamacare) is defined by a choice rule that uses inputs from the n different GAPs. We can think of the spread of support for a political candidate in a social network as a "game" in which the Nash equilibrium [Nash 1950] represents a stable adoption of positions by the members of the social network. When a Nash equilibrium occurs, no player has an incentive to deviate from his current position.

After introducing the syntax and semantics of ChoiceGAPs in Section 3, we formally define our game and the notions of "strong" and "Nash" equlibria in Section 5. Unfortunately, Nash equilibria require assumptions that are unrealistic in real world social networks. We show that every game (in our sense) can be expressed using a ChoiceGAP in such a way that the Nash equilibrium and the strong equilibrium coincide — thus, strong equilibria capture all the good points of Nash equilibria (for our games) without inheriting any of the disadvantages. We then study the complexity of various problems relating to these equilibria in Section 6. Specifically, and perhaps unsurprisingly, we show that these problems are computationally intractable.

[1]Specifically, the authors of [Shakarian et al. 2013] show that they can express cascade models such as [Cha et al. 2009a] used to model the spread of "favorites" in Flickr, tipping models such as the Jackson-Yariv model of product adoption in economics [Jackson and Yariv 2005], the SIR and the SIS models of disease spread [Anderson and May 1979; Hethcote 1976], as well as homophilic models such as those involving mobile phone usage [Aral et al. 2009]. Thus, GAPs can be used to represent many different diffusion models and hence we do not repeat these representations here.

Then, in Section 7, we provide mixed integer linear programs (MILPs for short) to capture coherent models of ChoiceGAPs and then use these MILPs in an algorithm to compute all strong equilibria. Because Section 6 shows that problems relating to the concept of our equilibra are intractable, we identify a class of ChoiceGAPs called "Vertex Independent Choice" (or VIC) programs and show that for a class of these called VIC_2 programs, we can find a strong equilibrium in polynomial time (and they are guaranteed to exist). However, the problem of finding all such equilibria is not likely to be polynomially computable. Section 9 looks at "queries" that a user may wish to express in such social network games – typically these queries compute expected diffusions of competing concepts. We develop algorithms to answer such queries under different assumptions.

Section 10 describes experiments we have carried out pertaining to a competitive situation during the 2013 Italian election using data gathered from FaceBook. We considered 4 different "competitions" and tested our algorithms with various combinations of diffusion models. We measured accuracy of our algorithms using the standard "Area Under ROC Curve" or AUROC metric. A receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve plots false positive rates on the x-axis and true-positive rates on the y-axis. The AUROC is the area under the resulting curve. An AUROC of 0.5 shows the algorithm has no predictive power. Depending upon the settings used in our algorithms, our experiments show that our algorithms achieve an avverage AUROC of 0.762, showing good predictive accuracy.

2. A SIMPLE MOTIVATING EXAMPLE

Suppose we want to study an election (say in the UK) between Labour and Tories using a social network such as FaceBook. Adoption of "likes" on FaceBook may diffuse through the network in accordance with a diffusion model for each party as shown below.[2]

$$\mathsf{DM_Labour} = \begin{cases} voteLabour(A) : X \leftarrow suptBrown(A) : X \\ voteLabour(B) : X \leftarrow voteLabour(A) : X,\ knows(B, A) : 1 \\ voteLabour(B) : X \leftarrow voteLabour(A) : X,\ mentor(B, A) : 1, \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\ student(B) : 1 \\ voteLabour(B) : X \leftarrow voteLabour(A) : X,\ olderRel(B, A) : 1 \end{cases}$$

$$\mathsf{DM_Tory} = \begin{cases} voteTory(A) : X \leftarrow likeCam(A) : X \\ voteTory(B) : X \leftarrow voteTory(A) : X,\ mentor(B, A) : 1, \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\ employee(B) : 1 \\ voteTory(B) : X \leftarrow voteTory(A) : X,\ idol(B, A) : 1, \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\ young(B) : 1 \end{cases}$$

Here, $voteLabour(A) : X$ and $voteTory(A) : Y$ denote the probabilities (X, Y) of the vertex A voting for Labour, resp. Tory, with value X and Y, respectively. The second rule in DM_Labour can intuitively be read as "If B knows A with 100% certainty and A will vote for Labour with X% certainty, then B will vote Labour with X% certainty.

[2]We will give a formal definition of diffusion models later.

Conflicting predicate symbols are specified explicitly in advance by the user or application. For instance, $voteLabour()$ and $voteTory()$ are conflicting predicate symbols because a user may have at most one of these two properties.[3] In contrast, predicates like $mentor()$ and $idol()$ may not be conflicting. Consequently, each person (vertex in the network) must choose the party to vote for according to his maximal utility, and then spread "good" vibes about his chosen party through the network.

For each conflicting vertex predicate vp, we introduce a "utility" predicate vp^U and a "decision" predicate vp^D. The former contains the utility value of the corresponding choice, while the latter represents the vertex's actual choice. Given a set of conflicting predicate symbols, for each vertex, only one corresponding decision atom must have a value greater than 0 and equal to the value of the corresponding utility atom, while others must have value 0. A ChoiceGAP (to be formally defined later) characterizing this situation is shown below. Such ChoiceGAPs can be automatically constructed once the set of conflicting predicates is specified and once the diffusion models for those individual predicates is known.

$$
\begin{aligned}
voteLabour^U(A):X &\leftarrow suptBrown(A):X\\
voteLabour^U(B):X &\leftarrow voteLabour^D(A):X,\ knows(B,A):1\\
voteLabour^U(B):X &\leftarrow voteLabour^D(A):X,\ mentor(B,A):1,\\
&\qquad\quad student(B):1\\
voteLabour^U(B):X &\leftarrow voteLabour^D(A):X,\ olderRel(B,A):1\\
voteTory^U(A):X &\leftarrow likeCam(A):X\\
voteTory^U(B):X &\leftarrow voteTory^D(A):X,\ mentor(B,A):1,\\
&\qquad\quad employee(B):1\\
voteTory^U(B):X &\leftarrow voteTory^D(A):X,\ idol(B,A):1,\\
&\qquad\quad young(B):1\\
voteTory^D(X), voteLabour^D(X) &\hookleftarrow voteTory^U(X), voteLabour^U(X)
\end{aligned}
$$

Each competing predicate symbol $voteLabour$ and $voteTory$ in our example diffusion models DM_Labour, DM_Tory respectively, thus has the associated predicate symbols $voteLabour^U$ and $voteLabour^D$.

When constructing a ChoiceGAP from a set of diffusion models, the conflicting predicates appearing in a rule head are replaced by the corresponding utility predicates, while the conflicting predicates appearing in the body are substituted by the corresponding decision predicates. Thus, the utility atoms for a vertex directly depend on the decision atoms of other vertexes. For instance, in the second rule above, we have $voteLabor^U(B):X \leftarrow voteLabor^D(A):X, knows(B,A):1$. This rule says that if A decides to vote labor with certainty X and B knows A for sure (100% certainty) then the utility to B of voting for labor is also X. *Note that when individual diffusion models (which have no utility/decision predicates) are combined, the resulting ChoiceGAPs have such predicates clearly distinguishing utility predicates and decision predicates.*

The last rule of the above ChoiceGAP is a "new type" of rule, called a *Vertex*

[3]Throughout this paper, we assume that conflicting predicate symbols are always unary, denoting a property of a user (vertex), e.g. vote-Labour vs. voteTory or pro-Obamacare vs. anti-Obamacare.

Choice rule (VC-rule for short), requiring that a vertex can only vote for one party. The body of the rule indicates the possible choices for a vertex, while the head contains the possible decisions. This rule imposes the fact that each vertex must choose according to utility values reported in its utility atoms and make a single choice, i.e. only one decision atom for that vertex is true.

Roughly speaking, each vertex operates like a diffusion model filter by deciding to spread one of the competing diffusion models — this model is selected according to the utility function. The vertex does not spread any other competing predicate.

EXAMPLE 1. Suppose Tom is a student ($student(Tom) : 1$) who likes Cameron with certainty 0.6 ($likeCam(Tom) : 0.6$), but who has a mentor John ($mentor(John, Tom) : 1$) who votes for Labour with certainty 0.8 ($voteLabour(John) : 0.8$). By the rules in the previous ChoiceGAPs Tom's utilities are as follows: $voteTory^U(Tom) : 0.6$ or $voteLabour^U(Tom) : 0.8$. As Tom's utility is bigger if he votes for Labour, the right choice for him is to vote for Labour: $voteLabour^D(Tom) : 0.8$ and $voteTory^D(Tom) : 0$. Thus, Tom diffuses his choice through the Labour diffusion model DM_Labour to his neighbors. □

3. CHOICE GAPS

In this section, we formally define a social network (SN) and introduce the *Choice Generalized Annotated Program (*cGAP*)* paradigm.

3.1 Social Network Formalization

We assume the existence of two arbitrary but fixed disjoint sets VP, EP of *vertex* and *edge predicate symbols* respectively. Each vertex predicate symbol has arity 1 and each edge predicate symbol has arity 2.

Definition 3.1. A *social network* is a 5-tuple $(\mathtt{V}, \mathtt{E}, l_{vert}, l_{edge}, w)$ where:

(1) $\mathtt{V}$ is a finite set whose elements are called *vertices*.
(2) $\mathtt{E} \subseteq \mathtt{V} \times \mathtt{V}$ is a finite multi-set whose elements are called edges.
(3) $l_{vert} : \mathtt{V} \to 2^{VP}$ is a function, called the vertex labeling function.
(4) $l_{edge} : \mathtt{E} \to EP$ is a function, called the edge labeling function.
(5) $w : E \to [0, 1]$ is a function, called a weight function. □

3.2 Syntax of Choice GAPs (*cGAP*s)

A *cGAP* consists of two parts:

(1) An "annotation" language;
(2) A logical language that is connected to the annotation language via certain shared syntactic elements.

3.2.1 cGAP *Annotation Language.* Let $AVar$ be a set of symbols (called "annotated variable symbols") ranging over the unit real interval $[0, 1]$ and let $\mathcal{F}$ be a set of symbols (called "annotation function symbols"), each with an associated arity.

Definition 3.2 *Annotation.* Annotations are inductively defined as follows:

(1) Any member of $[0, 1] \cup AVar$ is an annotation.

(2) If $f \in \mathcal{F}$ is an n-ary annotation function symbol and $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ are annotations, then $f(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ is an annotation. □

As in the case of Generalized Annotated Programs [Kifer and Subrahmanian 1992], note that each annotation function symbol f of arity i denotes some fixed pre-theoretically defined function from $[0,1]^i$ to $[0,1]$.

3.2.2 cGAP *Logical Language.* We define a separate logical language whose constants are members of $\mathtt{V}$ and whose predicate symbols consist of $VP \cup EP$. We also assume the existence of a set $\mathcal{V}$ of variables ranging over the constants (vertices). No function symbols are present. Terms and atoms are defined in the usual way (cf. [Lloyd 1987]). If $A = p(t_1, \ldots, t_n)$ is an atom and $p \in VP$ (resp. $p \in EP$), then A is called a vertex (resp. edge) atom.

Definition 3.3 *Annotated atom/ GAP-rule/GAP.* If A is an atom and μ is an annotation, then $A : \mu$ is an *annotated atom.* If A is a vertex (resp. edge) atom, then $A : \mu$ is also called a vertex (resp. edge) annotated atom. If $A_0 : f(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n)$, $A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n$ are annotated atoms, then

$$A_0 : f(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n) \leftarrow A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n$$

is an *annotated rule.* When $n = 0$, the above rule is called a *fact.* A *generalized annotated program (GAP)* is a finite set of annotated rules. An annotated atom (resp. a rule, a GAP) is *ground* iff there are no occurrence of variables from either $\mathtt{AVar}$ or $\mathcal{V}$ in it. □

Every social network $SN = (\mathtt{V}, \mathtt{E}, l_{vert}, l_{edge}, w)$ can be represented by the set of GAP-rules (actually facts) $\Pi_{SN} = \{q(v) : 1 \leftarrow \mid v \in \mathtt{V} \wedge q \in l_{vert}(v)\} \cup \{ep(v_1, v_2) : w(\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle) \leftarrow \mid \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle \in \mathtt{E} \wedge l_{edge}(\langle v_1, v_2 \rangle) = ep\}$. To construct a GAP from a social network SN, we look at each vertex v and each property q. If v has property q, then $q(v) : 1 \leftarrow$ is inserted into Π_{SN}. Likewise, we look at each edge $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathtt{E}$. If this edge has weight w and edge property ep, then we insert the fact $ep(v_1, v_2) : w \leftarrow$ into Π_{SN}. [Shakarian et al. 2013] has already shown that many classical diffusion models such as the SIR and SIS models for disease spread [Anderson and May 1979; Hethcote 1976], the Jackson-Yariv model for diffusion of product adoption [Jackson and Yariv 2005], the Flickr diffusion model [Cha et al. 2009a], and homophilic models [Aral et al. 2009] can all be expressed as GAPs.

*cGAP*s extend GAPs by adding a single rule called a *Vertex Choice (VC) Rule* inspired by Saccà and Zaniolo[Saccà and Zaniolo 1990] for classical Datalog. Every *cGAP* consists of a GAP together with a single vertex choice rule.

Definition 3.4 *Vertex choice (VC) rule.* Suppose $\{a_1, \ldots, a_m\}$ and $\{b_1, \ldots, b_m\}$ are two ordered sets of vertex predicate symbols. Then

$$b_1(X), \ldots, b_m(X) \hookleftarrow a_1(X), \ldots, a_m(X)$$

is a *vertex choice (VC) rule* of size m for the vertex X. A VC-rule is ground iff there are no occurrence of variables from $\mathcal{V}$ in it. □

Note that edge predicate symbols cannot appear anywhere inside a VC-rule. Moreover, usually, only conflicting predicate symbols occur within a VC-rule and usually

the predicate symbol b_i is the decision predicate corresponding to a utility predicate a_i. VC-rules do not contain any annotations.

For instance,

$$voteTory^D(X), voteLabour^D(X) \hookleftarrow voteTory^U(X), voteLabour^U(X)$$

is a VC-rule from our earlier example. Intuitively, this rule says that if $voteTory^U(X)$, $voteLabour^U(X)$ are true, then exactly one of $voteTory^D(X), voteLabour^D(X)$ can be true and that a choice must be made.

Definition 3.5 *Choice GAP.* A *Choice GAP* (*cGAP*) Π is a finite set of annotated rules plus a single vertex choice rule.

Though choice rules have only been applied in classical Datalog settings in the past and their combination with GAPs is new, we do not claim this as a major contribution of this paper as the combination is straightforward. However, the use of ChoiceGAPs for modeling competitive diffusion, and the new notions of equilibria we introduce, together with appropriate complexity results, algorithms, and efficiently computable fragments of ChoiceGAPs are new.

3.3 Semantics of *cGAP*

We are now ready to define the semantics of *cGAP*s. Given a *cGAP* Π, let `atoms` denote the set of all ground atoms of Π.

Definition 3.6 *Interpretation.* Given a a *cGAP* Π, an interpretation I for Π is any mapping $I : \texttt{atoms} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ of ground atoms to real numbers in $[0, 1]$. □

Thus, an interpretation merely assigns a certainty value to each ground atom in `atoms`. The set $\mathcal{I}$ of all interpretations can be partially ordered via the ordering $\preceq$ defined as follows: $I_1 \preceq I_2$ iff for all ground atoms A, $I_1(A) \leq I_2(A)$. $\mathcal{I}$ forms a complete lattice under the $\preceq$ ordering. Given two interpretations I_1 and I_2, we define their intersection $I_1 \cap I_2$ as the interpretation $(I_1 \cap I_2)$ such that $(I_1 \cap I_2)(A) = \min(I_1(A), I_2(A))$ for all $A \in \texttt{atoms}$. Similarly, the union $I_1 \cup I_2$ of interpretations I_1 and I_2 is the interpretation $I_1 \cup I_2$ such that $(I_1 \cup I_2)(A) = \max(I_1(A), I_2(A))$ for all $A \in \texttt{atoms}$. We are now ready to define satisfaction.

Definition 3.7 *Satisfaction.* Let I be an interpretation.

—I satisfies a ground annotated atom $A : \mu$, denoted $I \models A : \mu$, iff $I(A) \geq \mu$.

—I satisfies a ground *cGAP* annotated rule r of the form $A_0 : \mu_0 \leftarrow A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n$, denoted $I \models r$, iff $I(A_0) \geq \mu_0$ or for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $I \not\models A_i : \mu_i$.

—I satisfies a ground VC-rule r of the form $B_1, \ldots, B_m \hookleftarrow A_1, \ldots, A_m$, denoted $I \models r$, iff $\exists i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that $I(B_i) = I(A_i)$ and $\forall j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, $j \neq i$, $I(B_j) = 0 = I(A_j)$.

—I satisfies a non-ground GAP/VC rule iff it satisfies all ground instances of it.

—I satisfies a *cGAP* Π (or is a *model* of Π) iff I satisfies all rules in Π. □

A key part of this definition is the satisfaction of VC-rules. For I to satisfy a VC-rule r of the form shown above, there must exist exactly one pair (A_i, B_i) such that $I(A_i) = I(B_i) \geq 0$. For all other pairs (A_j, B_j), we have $I(A_j) = I(B_j) = 0$. We now provide a simple example.

EXAMPLE 2. Consider a social network SN and two diffusion models DM_1 and DM_2 relating to diffusion about the tendency to buy ASUS computers versus buying Macs. For this toy example which will be used throughout the paper, we assume these are the only two options of computers to buy (the same reasoning works if there are n different computers to buy). We assume there are two vertices $1, 2$ and a friend edge from 1 to 2.

$$SN = \ friend(1,2) : 1 \ \leftarrow$$

$$DM_1 = \begin{cases} buyAsus^U(1) : 0.6 \ \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^U(Y) : \mu \ \leftarrow \ friend(X,Y) : 1, buyAsus^D(X) : \mu \end{cases}$$

$$DM_2 = \begin{cases} buyMac^U(1) : 0.3 \ \leftarrow \\ buyMac^U(Y) : \mu \ \leftarrow \ friend(X,Y) : 1, buyMac^D(X) : \mu \end{cases}$$

Suppose we have the vertex choice rule

$$r : buyMac^D(X), buyAsus^D(X) \hookleftarrow buyMac^U(X), buyAsus^U(X)$$

Consider the two interpretations I_1 and I_2 shown below.

	$buyAsus^U(1)$	$buyAsus^D(1)$	$buyAsus^U(2)$	$buyAsus^D(2)$
I_1	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6
I_2	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.0
	$buyMac^U(1)$	$buyMac^D(1)$	$buyMac^U(2)$	$buyMac^D(2)$
I_1	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.0
I_2	0.3	0.0	0.7	0.7

Consider the situation of vertex 1. Interpretation I_1 assigns:

—0.6 to all ground atoms $buyAsus^D(1), buyAsus^U(1), buyAsus^D(2), buyAsus^U(2)$,
—0.3 to $buyMac^D(1)$,
—0 to $buyMac^U(1)$,
—0.3 to $buyMac^U(2)$, and
—0 to $buyMac^U(2)$.

We see that I_1 satisfies all the diffusion rules as well as the one VC-rule. Consider the ground instance of this VC-rule with $X = 1$. Exactly one of the two head decision atoms, $buyAsus^D(1)$ has a value greater than 0 (0.6) and this coincides with the value assigned by I_1 to $buyAsus^U(1)$. Likewise, when we consider the ground instance with $X = 2$, we see the same thing. Thus, I_1 is a model of the $cGAP$ program $\Pi = SN \cup DM_1 \cup DM_2 \cup \{r\}$.

In the same way, we can also establish that I_2 is also a model of Π. □

4. COHERENT MODELS AND STRONG EQUILIBRIA

The new technical contributions of this paper start here.

Though I_2 is a model of Π in the above example, it assigns overly high utilities. For instance, consider the second rule of DM_2 with the substitution $\theta = \{X = 1, Y = 2\}$. We know that for the ground atom $buyMac^D(1)$ in the body of this rule after θ is applied to it, $I_2(buyMac^D(1)) = 0$. But the head of this rule under

substitution θ, which is the atom $buyMac^U(2)$ is assigned a utility of 0.7 instead of the 0 that is the minimum needed for this rule to be satisfied. In order to address this, we define the concept of a *coherent* model.

Definition 4.1 *Coherence Transformation.* Suppose Π is a *cGAP*, $r \in ground(\Pi)$ is an instance of the single VC-rule in Π, and I an interpretation. Suppose r has the form $B_1(v), \ldots, B_m(v) \hookleftarrow A_1(v), \ldots, A_m(v)$ The *coherence-transform of* r is the set $\mathsf{coh}(r, I) = \{B_i(v) : \mu \leftarrow A_i(v) : \mu \mid I(A_i(v)) > 0 \text{ and } I(A_i(v)) = I(B_i(v))\}$. Note that this set can be empty.

The *coherence transform* of Π w.r.t. I is simply the GAP $ground(\Pi^{non_vc}) \cup \bigcup_{\substack{r \in ground(\Pi) \wedge \\ r \text{ is a VC-rule}}} \mathsf{coh}(r, I)$, where Π^{non_vc} is the set of all non-VC rules in Π.

Thus, the coherence transform of Π w.r.t. I simply looks at ground VC-rules in $ground(\Pi)$. If there is a ground atom $A_i(v)$ in the body of the rule such that $I(A_i(v)) > 0$ and $I(A_i(v)) = I(B_i(v))$, then we include the GAP rule $B_i(v) : I(B_i(v)) \leftarrow A_i(v) : I(B_i(v))$ in $\mathsf{coh}(\Pi, I)$ — otherwise we just get rid of the rule. All non-VC rules of Π are included in $\mathsf{coh}(\Pi, I)$. *Thus, $\mathsf{coh}(\Pi, I)$ is always a GAP which, by [Kifer and Subrahmanian 1992], is guaranteed to have a unique minimal model.* We use $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi)$ to denote the minimum model of a GAP Π. We can now define coherent models.

Definition 4.2 *Coherent model.* Let Π be a *cGAP* and let M be a model for Π. M is a *coherent model* for Π iff it is the minimum model of the GAP $\mathsf{coh}(\Pi, M)$. □

We now present a quick example of coherent models.

Example 3. We show that the model I_1 from Example 2 is a coherent model for the *cGAP* Π below.

$$\Pi = \begin{cases} friend(1,2) : 1 & \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^U(1) : 0.6 & \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^U(Y) : \mu & \leftarrow friend(X,Y) : 1, buyAsus^D(X) : \mu \\ buyMac^U(1) : 0.3 & \leftarrow \\ buyMac^U(Y) : \mu & \leftarrow friend(X,Y) : 1, buyMac^D(X) : \mu \\ buyMac^D(X), buyAsus^D(X) & \hookleftarrow buyMac^U(X), buyAsus^U(X) \end{cases}$$

Let r be the single VC-rule in Π. By grounding Π we obtain

$$ground(\Pi) = \begin{cases} friend(1,2) : 1 & \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^U(1) : 0.6 & \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^U(2) : 0.6 & \leftarrow friend(1,2) : 1, buyAsus^D(1) : 0.6 \\ buyMac^U(1) : 0.3 & \leftarrow \\ buyMac^D(1), buyAsus^D(1) & \hookleftarrow buyMac^U(1), buyAsus^U(1) \\ buyMac^D(2), buyAsus^D(2) & \hookleftarrow buyMac^U(2), buyAsus^U(2) \end{cases}$$

Consider each of the two ground VC-rules above. For the first VC-rule, we see that $I_1(buyMac^D(1)) \neq I_1(buyMac^U(1))$ and $I_1(buyAsus^D(1)) = I_1(buyAsus^U(1)) = 0.6 > 0$. Hence, the rule

$$buyAsus^D(1) : 0.6 \leftarrow buyAsus^U(1) : 0.6$$

belongs to the set $\mathsf{coh}(r, I_1)$, and gets added to the coherent transform of Π w.r.t. I_1, denoted by Π' in the following. Likewise, with the second VC-rule, we know that

Algorithm 1 Non-deterministic algorithm enumerating all coherent models.

procedure *coherentModel*(*cGAP* program Π, m competing choices)
  Let $\Pi' = ground(\Pi)$
  $X = \{r \mid r \in ground(\Pi)$ and r is a VC-rule $\}$.
  $\Pi' = \Pi' - X$.
  for each vertex choice rule $B_1(v), \ldots, B_m(v) \hookleftarrow A_1(v), \ldots, A_m(v)$ in X **do**
    guess a choice $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$
    insert the rule $B_i(v) : \mu \leftarrow A_i(v) : \mu$ into Π'
  end for
  Let I be the minimum model of Π'
  if I satisfies every vertex choice rule in X **then**
    return I
  else *fail*
  end if
end procedure

$I_1(buyMac^D(2)) = I_1(buyMac^U(2)) = 0$, and $I_1(buyAsus^D(2)) = I_1(buyAsus^U(2)) = 0.6 > 0$ and so we add the following GAP rule to Π':

$$buyAsus^D(2) : 0.6 \leftarrow buyAsus^U(2) : 0.6.$$

The final GAP Π' that we get is the following:

$$\Pi' = \begin{cases} friend(1,2) : 1 & \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^U(1) : 0.6 & \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^U(2) : 0.6 & \leftarrow friend(1,2) : 1, buyAsus^D(1) : 0.6 \\ buyMac^U(1) : 0.3 & \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^D(1) : 0.6 & \leftarrow buyAsus^U(1) : 0.6 \\ buyAsus^D(2) : 0.6 & \leftarrow buyAsus^U(2) : 0.6 \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that I_1 is the minimal model of Π'. Hence, I_1 is a coherent model of Π. □

Algorithm 1 presents a non-deterministic naive algorithm to compute all coherent models of Π. The algorithm looks at each VC-rule and non-deterministically chooses a pair $(A_i(v), B_i(v))$. If we think of these as the appropriate pair of atoms from the VC-rule, we insert the annotated rule $B_i(v) : Y \leftarrow A_i(v) : Y$. Such a rule is added for each ground VC-rule instance and we then compute the minimal model of the resulting GAP. If this minimal model satisfies every VC-rule, then it is clearly a coherent model — otherwise it is not.

The following result shows that the *coherentModel* function correctly finds the set of all coherent models.

PROPOSITION 4.3. *Algorithm 1 returns the set of all coherent models.*

We now introduce the concept of strong equilibrium.

Definition 4.4 *Strong Equilibrium.* A coherent model I is a *strong equilibrium* for a *cGAP* Π iff for each ground vertex choice rule of the form $B_1, \ldots, B_m \hookleftarrow$

$A_1, \ldots, A_m$ it is the case that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} I(B_i) = \max(I(A_1), \ldots, I(A_m))$$

□

Recall that by the definition of VC-rule satisfaction, there exists only one B_i such that $I(B_i) \geq 0$, while, for all other B_j, for $j \neq i$, $I(B_j) = 0$. Thus, a strong equilibrium is a coherent model where each choice coincides with the maximum annotation value, taken as a measure of utility, in the VC-rule body. We use $\texttt{SE}(\Pi)$ to denote the set of all strong equilibria of a *cGAP* Π. The set of all strong equilibria can be computed by enumerating all coherent models using Algorithm 1, and then selecting those models that are also strong equilibria.

EXAMPLE 4. *The coherent model I_1 from Examples 2 and 3 is a strong equilibrium because*

$$I_1(buyAsus^D(1)) + I_1(buyMac^D(1)) = 0.6 + 0.0 =$$

$$= \max(I_1(buyAsus^U(1)), I_1(buyMac^U(1))) = \max(0.6, 0.3) = 0.6$$

and

$$I_1(buyAsus^D(2)) + I_1(buyMac^D(2)) = 0.6 + 0.0 =$$

$$= \max(I_1(buyAsus^U(2)), I_1(buyMac^U(2))) = \max(0.6, 0.3) = 0.6$$

□

We are now ready to define when a *cGAP* entails an annotated atom.

Definition 4.5 *Entailment.* A *cGAP* Π entails a ground annotated atom AA, denoted $\Pi \models AA$, iff every strong equilibrium of Π satisfies AA. □

5. *CGAPS* : A GAME PERSPECTIVE

Let Π be a *cGAP*, SN be a social network, and let n be the number of vertices in SN. Each vertex v is considered to be a player $\mathcal{P}_v$. We use Γ_Π to denote the set of all players in Π. In this section, we first describe the concept of a state (which basically is an a mapping of players to actions, specifying the action the player takes). We develop a formal definition of a Nash equilibrium for the resulting game, as well as a relationship between states and strong equilibria for the game. This allows us to go back and forth between states that "represent" a strong equilibrium and strong equilibria.

Each player $\mathcal{P}_v \in \Gamma_\Pi$ has a the same set of actions (or strategies) $Q = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ where m is the size of the vertex choice rule in Π. These are the m competing choices the player can make (e.g. buying an Asus vs. buying a Mac, or voting Tory vs. voting for Labour).

A *state* S for a *cGAP* Π represents a choice for each player $\mathcal{P}_v$ and it is defined as a mapping $S : \Gamma_\Pi \to Q$.

Given a *cGAP* Π and a state S for Π, we define the notion of an *induced ground GAP* Π_S.

Definition 5.1 *Induced Ground GAP* Π_S. Suppose Π is a *cGAP* and S is a state for Π. We define a GAP Π_S that can be obtained from Π and S as follows:

(1) replace each ground VC-rule $r : b_1(v), \ldots, b_m(v) \hookleftarrow a_1(v), \ldots, a_m(v)$ in *ground* (Π), with the ground annotated rule $b_i(v) : X \leftarrow a_i(v) : X$ where $i = S(\mathcal{P}_v)$.

(2) All non-VC rules in Π are also in Π_S.

Intuitively, when considering the ground instance r of a VC-rule in Π and a state S, exactly one of the $b_i(v)$'s can be true in the state as a vertex v can make exactly one choice. This choice is the $i = S(\mathcal{P}_v)$.

PROPOSITION 5.2. *Let* Π *be a* cGAP *such that every predicate appearing in the head of the VC-rule does not appear in the head of a GAP rule, and let* S *be a state. Then, the minimal model of* Π_S *is a coherent model for* Π.

Given a state S, each player has a *utility value* for each of its actions. The utility $u(S, \mathcal{P}_v, i)$ of the player $\mathcal{P}_v$ performing the action $i \in Q$ in the state S is given by the value assumed by the atom $a_i(v)$ in the interpretation $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_S)$, i.e. we set $u(S, \mathcal{P}_v, i) = \mathcal{MM}(\Pi_S)(a_i(v))$, where $a_i(x)$ is the i'th atom in the body of the VC-rule. This value is the likelihood of the player performing action $i \in Q$ according to the GAP Π_S.

We assume that each player is a rational agent, i.e. he is motivated by maximizing his own payoff.

Definition 5.3 *state representation of strong equilibria.* A state S *represents a strong equilibrium* for Π iff for all players $\mathcal{P}_v \in \Gamma_\Pi$

$$u(S, \mathcal{P}_v, S(\mathcal{P}_v)) \geq u(S, \mathcal{P}_v, i)$$

for each action $i \in Q$.

Intuitively, a state is a choice of actions, one for each player. In contrast, strong equilibria, as defined in the previous section, is a coherent model of a *cGAP* that satisfies certain equilibrium conditions. The above definition specifies the relationship between states and strong equilibria so we can refer to the actions taken in a strong equilibrium as a state and vice versa.

FACT 1. *The set* $\{\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_S) \mid S$ *is a state* $\}$*, contains all strong equilibria for* Π. □

The above result specifies a set containing all possible strong equilibria - but not all members of $\{\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_S) \mid S$ is a state $\}$ are necessarily strong equilibria.

5.1 Nash equilibrium vs. strong equilibrium

A Nash equilibrium is a state where no player has anything to gain by unilaterally changing his own action. In order to define Nash equilibria, we first define the utility $\hat{u}(S, \mathcal{P}_v)$ of a state S for a player $\mathcal{P}_v$ as follows:

$$\hat{u}(S, \mathcal{P}_v) = u(S, \mathcal{P}_v, S(\mathcal{P}_v)).$$

This definition says the utility of the state S for player $\mathcal{P}_v$ is simply the utility of the action $S(\mathcal{P}_v)$ that he takes in that state.

Definition 5.4 *Nash equilibrium.* Let Π be a *cGAP* and S a state. $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_S)$ is a Nash equilibrium for Π iff for each player $\mathcal{P}_v$

$$\hat{u}(S, \mathcal{P}_v) \geq \hat{u}(S', \mathcal{P}_v)$$

for each S' such that $S(\mathcal{P}_{v'}) = S'(\mathcal{P}_{v'})$ if $v' \neq v$, and $S(\mathcal{P}_{v'}) \neq S'(\mathcal{P}_{v'})$ if $v' = v$. □

Intuitively, $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_S)$ is a Nash equilibrium if there is no other state S' in which all the players can obtain a higher utility. Thus, if one player tries to perform an action different from that in a Nash equilibrium (trying to raise his own utility), this would imply a reduced utility for some other player, who may then try to perform some other action, leading to an unstable situation.

The above definition of classical Nash equilibrium applied to competitive diffusion in SNs assumes that each player has common knowledge about:

(1) the whole structure of the social network (and every vertex in it),
(2) for all players, how they think (diffusion model mechanism for each vertex),
(3) the strategies adopted by each other player.

All these assumptions are needed to compute the utility $\hat{u}(S', p)$ — unfortunately, they are too strong for a real-world social network context. In most real-world social networks, we have information on our neighbors but not on others. Likewise, we are not privy to the strategies of the players and how they make decisions. Fortunately, the important theorem below says that we do not need these assumptions — strong equilibria can capture Nash equilibria for all games. We now recall the definition of a generic game from classical game theory.

There is no loss of generality in the assumption that the set of all actions is the same for each player. If some players have actions that other players cannot perform, then the utility of performing those other actions can be set to 0 for players who cannot perform them.

Definition 5.5 *Generic game.* A *generic game* G is a triple $G = (\hat{P}, \hat{Q}, \hat{U})$ where

—$\hat{P}$ is the set of players $\{p_1, \ldots, p_n\}$,
—$\hat{Q} = \{q_1, \ldots, q_m\}$ is the set of actions (the same for each player), and
—$\hat{U} = \{\hat{u}_1, \ldots, \hat{u}_n\}$ is the set of utility functions, one for each player, where a utility function is a function $\hat{u}_i : \underbrace{\hat{Q} \times \cdots \times \hat{Q}}_{n} \to \Re$,

We now state our important representation theorem.

Theorem 5.6. Nash equilibria can be captured by strong equilibria of *cGAP*s. *For every generic game* $G = (\hat{P}, \hat{Q}, \hat{U})$, *there exists a* cGAP Π *such that the strong equilibria of* Π *coincide with the Nash equilibria of* G.

We now illustrate the above result on the well-known Prisoner's Dilemma problem.

Example 5 Prisoner's Dilemma. *Consider the well known game of prisoner's dilemma where the set of players is* $\hat{P} = \{A, B\}$, *the set of actions is* $\hat{Q} = \{c, d\}$ *(cooperate, i.e. confess or defect, i.e. don't cooperate), and the utility functions* $\hat{U}$ *are represented in the following matrix*

	Prisoner B cooperates	*Prisoner B defects*
Prisoner A cooperates	*(-6,-6)*	*(0,-7)*
Prisoner A defects	*(-7,0)*	*(-1,-1)*

For logic program readers, the entry (0,-7) says that Prisoner A's utility when he cooperates and B defects is 0, while prisoner B's utility (when A cooperates and B defects) is -7. The equivalent cGAP Π^G *according to the construction in the preceding proof is obtained as follows:*

—we add the following vertex choice rule

$$c^D(X), d^D(X) \leftrightarrow c^U(X), d^U(X)$$

—we add the following facts

$$c^U(A) : 0.1 \leftarrow$$
$$c^U(B) : 0.1 \leftarrow$$
$$d^U(A) : 0.1 \leftarrow$$
$$d^U(B) : 0.1 \leftarrow$$

where we used $\varepsilon = 0.1$

—by considering the scaled (in the interval $[0, 0.9]$*) version of the utility matrix*

	Prisoner B cooperates	*Prisoner B defects*
Prisoner A cooperates	$(\mu^A_{(c,c)} = 0.13,\ \mu^B_{(c,c)} = 0.13)$	$(\mu^A_{(c,d)} = 0.9,\ \mu^B_{(c,d)} = 0)$
Prisoner A defects	$(\mu^A_{(d,c)} = 0,\ \mu^B_{(d,c)} = 0.9)$	$(\mu^A_{(d,d)} = 0.78, \mu^B_{(d,d)} = 0.78)$

we add the following rules

$$c^U(A) : 0.23 \leftarrow c^D(B) : 0.1$$
$$c^U(A) : 1.00 \leftarrow d^D(B) : 0.1$$
$$d^U(A) : 0.10 \leftarrow c^D(B) : 0.1$$
$$d^U(A) : 0.88 \leftarrow d^D(B) : 0.1$$
$$c^U(B) : 0.23 \leftarrow c^D(A) : 0.1$$
$$c^U(B) : 1.00 \leftarrow d^D(A) : 0.1$$
$$d^U(B) : 0.10 \leftarrow c^D(A) : 0.1$$
$$d^U(B) : 0.88 \leftarrow d^D(A) : 0.1$$

The Nash equilibrium for the prisoner's dilemma is the state (c, c)*, i.e. both prisoners decide to confess. The minimal model of the program* $\Pi^G_{(c,c)}$ *induced by the state* (c, c) *is* $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi^G_{(c,c)}) = \{c^U(A) : 0.23, c^U(B) : 0.23, c^D(A) : 0.23, c^D(B) : 0.23, d^U(A) : 0.10, d^U(B) : 0.10\}$ *which is a strong equilibrium for* Π^G*, because*

$$\mathcal{MM}(\Pi^G_{(c,c)})(c^D(X)) \geq \mathcal{MM}(\Pi^G_{(c,c)})(c^U(X))$$
$$\mathcal{MM}(\Pi^G_{(c,c)})(c^D(X)) \geq \mathcal{MM}(\Pi^G_{(c,c)})(d^U(X))$$

for $X \in \{A, B\}$.

In a similar way it is possible to check that the minimal model of the programs induced by the remaining states are not strong equilibria for Π^G. □

The concluding message of this section is simple. cGAP*s and strong equilibria together can express the notion of Nash equilibria in general games. As a consequence, in the rest of this paper, we will consider strong equilibria of* cGAP*s.*

The following example shows a *cGAP* where there exists a strong equilibrium that is not a Nash equilibrium.

EXAMPLE 6. *Consider the following program*

$$\begin{array}{ll} buyMac^U(1) : 0.3 & \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^U(1) : 0.3 & \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^U(1) : 0.6 & \leftarrow\ buyAsus^D(1) : 0.3 \\ buyMac^D(X), buyAsus^D(X) & \hookleftarrow\ buyMac^U(X), buyAsus^U(X) \end{array}$$

We have only two strong equilibria, one for each choice of player 1

	$buyAsus^U(1)$	$buyAsus^D(1)$	$buyMac^U(1)$	$buyMac^D(1)$
SE_a	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.0
SE_b	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.3

The strong equilibrium SE_b *is not a Nash equilibrium because if player* 1 *changes his choice (buyMac) to buyAsus, his utility increases (see strong equilibrium* SE_a*).* □

5.2 Social Network Game and Obligatory Product Selection

[Apt and Simon 2013] define a social network game where all users of the social network must choose one product from among a set of products and their utilities depend on the choices of their neighbors. This paper defines a social network as follows.

Definition 5.7. [Apt and Simon 2013] A social network consists of:

—a weighted directed graph $G_{sn} = (V, E, W)$ where
  —V is the set of agents,
  —E is a set of directed edges between agents,
  —$W : E \to (0, 1]$ is a weighted function associating a weight with each edge;
—a set $\mathcal{P} = \{1, \ldots, h\}$ of products;
—a function $P : V \to 2^P \setminus \emptyset$ associating, with each agent, a non empty subset of products;
—a threshold function $\theta : V \times P \to (0, 1]$ associating, with each agent and each product, a threshold value. □

Each agent $v \in V$ chooses a product in $P(v)$. Let s denote the joint strategy of the agents, i.e. $s : V \to \mathcal{P}$ assigns a product to each vertex.

Let c_0 be a constant in $(0, 1]$ and $N(i) = \{j | (j, i) \in E\}$. The utility function $\overline{u}_v$, for each agent $v \in V$ and for each joint strategy s, is defined as follows:

$$\overline{u}_v(s) = \begin{cases} c_0 & if\ \ N(v) = \emptyset \\ 1/2 + \frac{1}{2*|N(v)|} \sum_{i \in N(v), s_i = s_v} w((i, v)) - \theta(v, s_i) & otherwise \end{cases}$$

Note that in the utility, we add the term $1/2 + \frac{1}{2*|N(v)|}$ in order to ensure that the utility function returns a value in the $[0, 1]$ interval. Obviously, this modification does not change the game. We call this game, the Apt-Simon Social Network Game and denote its by the tuple $(G_{sn}, \mathcal{P}, P, \theta, c_0)$.

THEOREM 5.8. APT-SIMON SOCIAL NETWORK GAME AND STRONG EQUILIBRIA OF *cGAPs*. *For every social network game* $(G_{sn}, \mathcal{P}, P, \theta, c_0)$ *there exists a* cGAP Π *such that the strong equilibria of* Π *coincide with the Nash equilibria of* $(G_{sn}, \mathcal{P}, P, \theta, c_0)$.

The following theorem provides a new special case of Apt-Simon social network games where a Nash equilibrium always exists and can be computed in PTIME.

THEOREM 5.9. *For every social network game* $(G_{sn}, \mathcal{P}, P, \theta, c_0)$ *where* $\mathcal{P}$ *has only two products (*$|\mathcal{P}| = 2$*) a Nash equilibrium always exists and can be computed in PTIME.*

6. *CGAP* COMPLEXITY

In this section, we study the computational complexity of various problems related to strong equilibria. We start by noting that strong equilibria may not always exist. This is due to two factors,

—there exist rule heads (or facts) containing a predicate symbol present in the head of the vertex choice rule, or

—atoms expressed in the vertex choice rule have mutual dependencies encoded within the GAP rules, leading to potential "conflict" and non-existence of strong equilibria.

Examples 7 and 8 below show the first and the second case, respectively.

EXAMPLE 7. Both the programs Π_1 and Π_2 do not have any strong equilibrium.

$$\Pi_1 = \begin{cases} buyMac^D(tom) : 1 & \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^D(tom) : 1 & \leftarrow \\ buyMac^D(X), buyAsus^D(X) & \hookleftarrow buyMac^U(X), buyAsus^U(X) \end{cases}$$

$$\Pi_2 = \begin{cases} buyMac^D(tom) : 1 & \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^U(tom) : 1 & \leftarrow \\ buyMac^D(X), buyAsus^D(X) & \hookleftarrow buyMac^U(X), buyAsus^U(X) \end{cases}$$

In the case of Π_1, the VC-rule is not satisfied because of the presence of the two facts containing predicates involved in the head of the vertex choice rule, while in Π_2 the vertex choice rule is satisfied. □

EXAMPLE 8. Consider the following program

$$\Pi = \begin{cases} friend(tom, bob) : 1 & \leftarrow \\ buyAsus^U(bob) : 0.5 & \leftarrow \\ buyMac^U(X) : 1 & \leftarrow friend(X, Y) : 1, buyMac^D(Y) : 0.5 \\ buyAsus^U(X) : 1 & \leftarrow friend(X, Y) : 1, buyAsus^D(Y) : 0.5 \\ buyMac^U(Y) : \mu & \leftarrow friend(X, Y) : 1, buyAsus^D(X) : \mu \\ buyAsus^U(Y) : \mu & \leftarrow friend(X, Y) : 1, buyMac^D(X) : \mu \\ buyMac^D(X), buyAsus^D(X) & \hookleftarrow buyMac^U(X), buyAsus^U(X) \end{cases}$$

Since the vertex predicate $buyMac^U$ depends on $buyAsus^U$ and vice versa, a strong equilibrium does not exist. □

Our first complexity result shows that determining existence of strong equilibria is an NP-complete problem.

THEOREM 6.1 STRONG EQUILIBRIA EXISTENCE COMPLEXITY. *Given a* cGAP Π *as input, the problem of deciding whether there* Π *has a strong equilibrium is* **NP***-complete under data and combined complexity.* □

A major problem occurs when multiple strong equilibria exist. In this case, a player who computes all of these strong equilibria may not know which strong equilibria the other players might act in accordance with. Thus, he may wish to know if a particular action he is considering is true in all strong equilibria. This problem too is intractable.

THEOREM 6.2 COMPLEXITY OF TRUTH IN ALL STRONG EQUILIBRIA. *Given a* cGAP *program* Π *and a ground annotated atom* AA *as input, the problem of deciding whether* $\Pi \models AA$ *is* **coNP***-complete under data and combined complexity.* □

Finally, we show results on the counting complexity of strong equilibria. Not surprisingly, these results also indicate intractability.

THEOREM 6.3 COUNTING COMPLEXITY OF STRONG EQUILIBRIA.

—*Given a* cGAP *program* Π *as input, the problem of counting the number of strong equilibria is* **#P***-complete under data and combined complexity.*

—*Given a positive integer* k *and* cGAP *program* Π *as input, the problem of deciding whether* Π *has at least* k *strong equilibria is in* **PSPACE** *and* **PP***-hard.* □

7. MILP STRONG EQUILIBRIUM FORMULATION FOR LINEAR *CGAP*S

A *cGAP* program is *linear* if all rules have the form:

$$A : \alpha_1 X_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n X_n \leftarrow B_1 : X_1, \ldots, B_n : X_n.$$

Linear GAPs were introduced in [Shakarian et al. 2013] where the authors also showed that most classical diffusion models studied in the literature have linear approximations.

For any GAP Π', Kifer and Subrahmanian [Kifer and Subrahmanian 1992] show how to associate an operator $T_{\Pi'}$ that maps interpetations to interpretations as follows. $T_{\Pi'}(I)(A) = \mathsf{sup}\{\mu |\ A : \mu \leftarrow B_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, B_n : u_n\}$ is a ground instance of a rule in Π' and for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $I(B_i) \geq \mu_i\}$. [Kifer and Subrahmanian 1992] shows that $T_{\Pi'}$ is a monotonic operator on a complete lattice and that it has a least fixpoint $\mathsf{lfp}(T_{\Pi'})$. Moreover, $\mathsf{lfp}(T_{\Pi'})$ can be computed by iteratively applying the $T_{Pi'}$ operator.

Suppose $\perp$ is the interpetation that assigns 0 to all ground atoms. Then $T_{\Pi'} \uparrow 0 = \perp$. For successor ordinals $\alpha + 1$, we set $T_{\Pi'} \uparrow (\alpha + 1) = T_{\Pi'}(T_{\Pi'} \uparrow \alpha)$. For limit ordinals α, we set $T_{\Pi'} \uparrow \alpha(A) = \mathsf{sup}\{T_{\Pi'} \uparrow \beta(A) \mid \beta < \alpha\}$. By the Tarski-Knaster theorem, we are guaranteed that $\mathsf{lfp}(T_{\Pi'}) = T_{\Pi'} \uparrow \alpha$ for some ordinal α. Additionally, Kifer and Subrahmanian [Kifer and Subrahmanian 1992] show that $\mathsf{lfp}(T_{\Pi'}) = \mathcal{MM}(\Pi')$. A GAP is *finitary* iff $\mathsf{lfp}(T_{\Pi'}) = T_{\Pi'} \uparrow k$ for some integer k. We can extend this to *cGAP*s as well.

Definition 7.1. A *cGAP* Π is finitary iff, for all interpretations I, the coherent transform of Π w.r.t. I (that is a GAP) is finitary.

If we compute the minimal model of the GAPs Π' in Step (9) of Algorithm 1, then we can develop an algorithm that uses mixed integer linear programs to compute the set of all strong equilibria of a *cGAP* Π. The use of mixed integer linear programs for logic program computation was initially proposed by [Bell et al. 1994; 1996] — however, they did not consider either GAPs or Choice Logic Programs.

Our Mixed Integer Linear Programming algorithm requires having an upper bound $\widehat{T}$ on the maximum number of iterations needed to compute the least fixpoint of Π' for each possible choice in Algorithm 1. We assume in the sequel that $\widehat{T}$ is such an upper bound — later, in Section 7.4, we will provide a simple algorithm to compute $\widehat{T}$.

7.1 Mixed Integer Linear Program (MILP)

In this section we describe how to represent strong equilibria via a mixed integer linear formulation.

7.2 Variables in the MILP

We start by defining the variables in the MILP we are constructing.

—x_A^t: For each $0 \leq t \leq \widehat{T}$ and each ground atom A, the variable $x_A^t \in [0,1]$ denotes the value assigned to A by $T_{\Pi'} \uparrow t$. Consequently, we fix $x_A^0 = 0$ for all A.

—z_i^t: For each $1 \leq t \leq \widehat{T}$ and for each GAP rule $r_i : A_0 : \mu_0 \leftarrow A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n$, the variable z_i^t denotes the value assigned to μ_0 by the rule r_i in the interpretation $T_{\Pi'} \uparrow (t-1)$.

The following example will be used in this section in order to help the reader understand the constraints used in our MILP.

Example 9. *Consider the following ground cGAP program*

$$\begin{array}{lll} r_1) & a_1 : 0.3 & \leftarrow \\ r_2) & a_1 : 0.6 & \leftarrow \ b_1 : 0.3 \\ r_3) & b_1, b_2 & \hookleftarrow \ a_1, a_2 \end{array}$$

and assume that $\widehat{T} = 2$. *Then, we have the following real variables:*

$$x_{a_1}^0, x_{a_2}^0, x_{b_1}^0, x_{b_2}^0, x_{a_1}^1, x_{a_2}^1, x_{b_1}^1, x_{b_2}^1, x_{a_1}^2, x_{a_2}^2, x_{b_1}^2, x_{b_2}^2$$

$$z_1^1, z_2^1, z_1^2, z_2^2$$

Note that as r_3 *is not a GAP rule, we do not consider it in the definition of the variables* z. □

7.3 Constraints in the MILP

We now define the constraints of the MILP. There are 4 types of constraints in the MILP. We describe each type below and provide examples where appropriate.

7.3.1 *Type 1 Constraints.* For each atom A and for each $1 \leq t \leq \widehat{T}$, let $rules(A) = \{r_{j_1}, \ldots, r_{j_h}\}$ be the set of all annotated rules in Π' having A in the head.

—If $rules(A) = \emptyset$ and A does not appear in a head of a vertex choice rule, we add the constraint $x_A^t = 0$. This corresponds to the case where A has no chance of being true as no ground rule has A as its head.

—If $rules(A) \neq \emptyset$ we model the fact that $x_A^t = \max_{r_i \in rules(A)} z_i^t$ by introducing a binary variable u_i^t for each rule $r_i \in rules(A)$, and the following constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} z_i^t - x_A^t - u_i^t &\geq -1 \quad \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, h\} \\ x_A^t - z_i^t &\geq 0 \quad \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, h\} \\ \sum_{i=1}^{h} u_i^t &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

In fact, as $x_A^t \geq z_i^t \; \forall i \in \{1, \ldots, h\}$ and there must exist only one rule r_i for which $x_A^t \leq z_i^t$ (third and second constraints, respective), then x_A^t will assume the value of the maximum z_i^t.

Example 10. *By considering the program in Example 9, we see that the only atom A having $rules(A) \neq \emptyset$ is a_1 for which $rules(a_1) = \{r_1, r_2\}$. Moreover, only a_2 satisfies the condition for which $rules(a_2) = \emptyset$ and a_2 does not appear in the head of the vertex choice rule. We therefore have the following set of constraints:*

$$\begin{aligned} x_{a_2}^t &= 0 \quad \forall t \in \{0,1,2\} \\ x_{a_1}^0 &= 0 \\ z_1^t - x_{a_1}^t - u_1^t &\geq -1 \quad \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\ z_2^t - x_{a_1}^t - u_2^t &\geq -1 \quad \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\ x_{a_1}^t - z_1^t &\geq 0 \quad \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\ x_{a_1}^t - z_2^t &\geq 0 \quad \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\ u_1^t + u_2^t &= 1 \\ u_1^t, u_2^t &\in \{0,1\} \end{aligned}$$

□

7.3.2 *Type 2 Constraints.* For each $1 \leq t \leq \widehat{T}$ and for each rule $r_i \in rules(A)$ of the form

$$r_i) \;\; A_0 : f(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n) \leftarrow A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n, C_1 : c_1, \ldots, C_l : c_l$$

where $c_1, \ldots, c_l$ are constants, and $C_1 : c_1, \ldots, C_l : c_l$ is a condition for the activation of the rule, we introduce

—$l + 1$ binary variables $v_1^t, \ldots, v_l^t, v_{1,l}^t$, where each variable v_j^t, $1 \leq j \leq l$, checks if the condition $C_j : c_j$ is satisfied, and the binary variable $v_{1,l}$ checks if the whole condition $C_1 : c_1, \ldots, C_l : c_l$ is satisfied

—the following constraints:

$$v_j^t - x_{C_j}^{t-1} \geq \epsilon - c_j \quad \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, l\} \tag{1}$$
$$x_{C_j}^{t-1} - v_j^t \geq c_j - 1 \quad \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, l\} \tag{2}$$
$$v_j^t - v_{1,l}^t \geq 0 \quad \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, l\} \tag{3}$$
$$v_{1,l}^t - \sum_{j=1}^{l} v_j^t \geq 1 - l \tag{4}$$
$$-z_i^t + v_{1,l}^t \geq 0 \tag{5}$$
$$z_i^t - f(x_{A_1}^{t-1}, \ldots, x_{A_n}^{t-1}) - v_{1,l}^t \geq -1 \tag{6}$$
$$f(x_{A_1}^{t-1}, \ldots, x_{A_n}^{t-1}) - z_i^t - v_{1,l}^t \geq -1 \tag{7}$$

where ϵ is a very small real number used to map the strictly greater constraints. Constraint (1) imposes that $v_j^t = 1$ if $x_{C_j}^{t-1} \geq c_j$, while Constraint (2) imposes that $v_j^t = 0$ if $x_{C_j}^{t-1} < c_j$. Observe that the above constraints are correct for $c_j^t \geq \epsilon$. If $c_j^t = 0$, then c_j^t can be removed from the constraints. Constraint (3) requires that if there exists a $v_j^t = 0$, i.e. the whole condition is not satisfies, then $v_{1,l}^t = 0$, while Constraint (4) imposes that if $v_j^t = 1$, for $1 \leq j \leq l$, i.e. the whole condition is satisfied, then $v_{1,l}^t = 1$. Constraint (5) imposes that, if $v_{1,l}^t = 0$, then $z_i^t = 0$, while if $v_{1,l}^t = 1$, from Constraints (6) and (7) we have that $z_i^t = f(x_{A_1}^{t-1}, \ldots, x_{A_n}^{t-1})$.
Observe that the values of variables z_i^t computed at step t depend on the values of the variables $x_{A_1}^{t-1}, \ldots, x_{A_n}^{t-1}$ computed at step $t-1$.

We now present an example of Type (2) constraints.

Example 11. *Consider the rule*

$$r_2)\ a_1(1) : 0.6 \leftarrow b_1(1) : 0.3$$

of the program in Example 9. We have just one condition $b_1(1) : 0.3$. *Hence, we have the following set of constraints:*

$$\begin{array}{cc}
v_1^t - x_{b_1}^{t-1} & \geq \epsilon - 0.3 \quad \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\
x_{b_1}^{t-1} - v_1^t & \geq 0,3 - 1 \quad \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\
v_1^t - v_{1,1}^t & \geq 0 \quad \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\
v_{1,1}^t - v_1^t & \geq 0 \quad \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\
-z_2^t + v_{1,1}^t & \geq 0 \quad \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\
z_2^t - 0.6 - v_{1,1}^t & \geq -1 \quad \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\
0.6 - z_2^t - v_{1,1}^t & \geq -1 \quad \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\
v_1^t, v_{1,1}^t & \in \{0,1\}
\end{array}$$

□

7.3.3 *Type 3 Constraints.* For each ground vertex choice rule r_p of the form $r_p : B_1, \ldots, B_m \hookleftarrow A_1, \ldots, A_m$, we introduce m binary variables $y_{r_p}^1, \ldots, y_{r_p}^m$, and

the following constraints:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} y^i_{r_p} = 1$$

and for each $1 \leq t \leq T$

$$\begin{aligned} x^t_{B_i} - x^t_{A_i} - y^i_{r_p} &\geq -1 \ \ \forall i \in \{1,\ldots,m\} \\ x^t_{A_i} - x^t_{B_i} - y^i_{r_p} &\geq -1 \ \ \forall i \in \{1,\ldots,m\} \\ x^t_{B_i} + y^i_{r_p} &\geq 0 \ \ \forall i \in \{1,\ldots,m\} \\ -x^t_{B_i} + y^i_{r_p} &\geq 0 \ \ \forall i \in \{1,\ldots,m\} \end{aligned}$$

The above set of constraints means that only one variable $y^i_{r_p}$ can be 1 (and the others must be 0), and if $y^i_{r_p} = 1$ then $x^t_{B_i} = x^t_{A_i}$, otherwise $x^t_{B_i} = 0$.

EXAMPLE 12. *By considering the VC-rule*

$$r_3)\ b_1, b_2 \hookleftarrow a_1, a_2$$

of the program in Example 9, we have the following set of constraints:

$$\begin{array}{rll} y^1_{r_3} + y^2_{r_3} & = 1 & \\ x^t_{b_1} - x^t_{a_1} - y^1_{r_3} & \geq -1 & \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\ x^t_{b_2} - x^t_{a_2} - y^2_{r_3} & \geq -1 & \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\ x^t_{a_1} - x^t_{b_1} - y^1_{r_3} & \geq -1 & \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\ x^t_{a_2} - x^t_{b_2} - y^2_{r_3} & \geq -1 & \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\ x^t_{b_1} + y^1_{r_3} & \geq 0 & \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\ x^t_{b_2} + y^1_{r_3} & \geq 0 & \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\ -x^t_{b_1} + y^1_{r_3} & \geq 0 & \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\ -x^t_{b_2} + y^2_{r_3} & \geq 0 & \forall t \in \{1,2\} \\ y^1_{r_3}, y^2_{r_3} & \in \{0,1\} & \end{array}$$

□

7.3.4 *Type 4 Constraints.* All the previous constraints guarantee that each feasible solution for them is a coherent model for the *cGAP*. To guarantee that such a coherent model is also a strong equilibrium we have to add the following constraints for each vertex choice rule r_c of the form $r_c : B_1, \ldots, B_m \hookleftarrow A_1, \ldots, A_m$:

$$-x^{\widehat{T}}_{A_j} + \sum_{i=1}^{m} x^{\widehat{T}}_{B_i} \geq 0 \ \ \forall j \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$$

Since only one $x^{\widehat{T}}_{B_j}$, $1 \leq j \leq m$, can be greater than or equal to 0, and the others must be 0, then $\sum_{i=1}^{m} x^{\widehat{T}}_{B_i} = x^{\widehat{T}}_{B_j}$ and the constraints impose that $x^{\widehat{T}}_{B_i} \geq x^{\widehat{T}}_{A_j}$, $\forall j \in \{1,\ldots,m\}$, i.e. the condition of strong equilibrium is satisfied.

EXAMPLE 13. *By considering the program in Example 9, we have that the conditions establishing the strong equilibrium are:*

$$\begin{aligned} -x^2_{a_1} + x^2_{b_1} + x^2_{b_2} &\geq 0 \\ -x^2_{a_2} + x^2_{b_1} + x^2_{b_2} &\geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Algorithm 2 Algorithm computing $\widehat{T}$.

procedure *compute*$\widehat{T}$($cGAP$ program Π, δ)
  $\overline{T} = \delta$
  while ($oracle(\Pi, \overline{T}) = false$) **do**
    $\overline{T} = \overline{T} + \delta$
  end while
  $min = \overline{T} - \delta$, $max = \overline{T}$
  $t = \lfloor (min + max)/2 \rfloor$
  while ($min < max - 1$) **do**
    if ($oracle(\Pi, t) = true$) **then**
      $max = t$
    else $min = t$
    end if
    $t = \lfloor (min + max)/2 \rfloor$
  end while
  return max
end procedure

procedure $oracle$($cGAP$ program Π, $\overline{T}$)
  Solve $\max \sum_{A \text{ ground atom in } \Pi} x_A^{\overline{T}} - x_A^{\overline{T}-1}$ s.t. $ILC(\Pi, \overline{T})$
  if ($\sum_{(A \text{ ground atom in } \Pi)} x_A^{\overline{T}} - x_A^{\overline{T}-1} = 0$) **then**
    return $true$
  end if
  return $false$
end procedure

□

Given a $cGAP$ Π and the maximum number of iterations $\widehat{T}$, let $ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T})$ denote the set of constraints listed above, i.e. the constraints of types (1) – (4). From the constraint description provided above, we can derive the following trivial propositions.

PROPOSITION 7.2. *Let* Π *be a finitary linear GAP. The set of type (1) and (2) constraints has a unique solution that coincides with the least fixpoint model of* Π. □

PROPOSITION 7.3. *Let* Π *be a finitary linear* cGAP. *Every solution for the set of Type (1), (2), and (3) constraints represents a coherent model for* Π. □

PROPOSITION 7.4. *Let* Π *be a finitary linear* cGAP. *Every solution for the set* $ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T})$ *of constraints represents a strong equilibrium of* Π. □

The above theorems capture the fact that the constraints in $ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T})$ neatly capture strong equilibria of Π.

7.4 Algorithm to find $\widehat{T}$: the maximum number of iterations needed

Algorithm 2 provides a method to compute the maximum number of iterations $\widehat{T}$ referenced above. Basically, Algorithm 2 uses a oracle that checks whether all

Algorithm 3 Algorithm enumerating all strong equilibria.

1: **procedure** *enumerate*(*cGAP* program Π)
2: Let $\Sigma = ILC(\Pi)$ and $Sol = \{\}$.
3: **while** A feasible solution s for Σ exists **do**
4: $Sol = Sol \cup \{s\}$.
5: Let $k^1_{r_p}, \ldots, k^m_{r_p}$ the values assumed in s by the variables $y^1_{r_p}, \ldots, y^m_{r_p}$
6: Add to Σ the constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^{|\Gamma_\Pi|}\sum_{j=1}^{m} y^j_{r_i}(1-k^j_{r_i}) + \sum_{i=1}^{|\Gamma_\Pi|}\sum_{j=1}^{m}(1-y^j_{r_i})k^j_{r_i} \geq 1$$

7: **end while**
8: **return** *Sol*
9: **end procedure**

the solutions of constraints $ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T})$ represent fixpoints, and finds the minimum value $\widehat{T}$ for which the oracle answer is true. Formally, the oracle returns true if $\sum_{(A \text{ ground atom in } \Pi)} x_A^{\widehat{T}} - x_A^{\widehat{T}-1} = 0$, i.e. does not exist a solution for which the fixpoint is not reached, while it returns false if $\sum_{(A \text{ ground atom in } \Pi)} x_A^{\widehat{T}} - x_A^{\widehat{T}-1} > 0$, i.e. there exists a solution for which the fixpoint is not reached. Then, Procedure *compute*$\widehat{T}$ increases $\overline{T}$ by a quantity δ given in input, until the oracle returns "true" as the answer. Then, by using a binary search, it finds the minimum value of $t \in (\overline{T} - \delta, \overline{T}]$ for which the oracle still answers true.

7.5 Algorithm to find all strong equilibria

We now present an algorithm (Algorithm 3) to find all strong equilibria of a *cGAP* Π by using $ILC(\Pi)$.

According to Proposition 7.4, strong equilibria of Π correspond exactly to solutions of $ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T})$. Algorithm 3 enumerates the set of all strong equilibria by first finding one solution of $ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T})$ (step 3). It then adds a constraint (step 6) that performs a "cut" on the convex polytope defined by $ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T})$. This cut eliminates the strong equilibrium s and no other strong equilibria. We then add this constraint to $ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T})$ and continue the process of solving the now expanded $ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T})$ till $ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T})$ becomes unsolvable.

8. VERTEX INDEPENDENT CHOICE PROGRAMS

As strong equilibria may not exist for all *cGAP*s we will define a class of programs called *vertex independent choice (VIC) programs*, for which a strong equilibrium always exists when the size of the vertex choice rule is 2. We use VIC_2 to denote this class of programs.

Definition 8.1 *Dependency graph.* Suppose Π is a *cGAP*. The dependency graph $\mathcal{G}(\Pi)$ associated with Π has the set VP of vertex predicates as the set of vertices. The set E of edges is defined as follows: $(p_2, p_1) \in E$ iff

—there is a *cGAP* rule r with p_2 appearing in *body*(r) and p_1 in *head*(r), or

—in the vertex choice rule

$$r : B_1, \ldots, B_m \hookleftarrow A_1, \ldots, A_m$$

there is an $1 \leq i \leq m$ such that p_2 appears in A_i and p_1 appears in B_i. □

We are now ready to define a VIC program.

Definition 8.2 *Vertex Independent Choice (VIC) program.* A *cGAP* Π is said to be *Vertex Independent Choice (VIC)* if

(1) every predicate symbol appearing in the head of the VC-rule in Π does not appear in the head of a GAP rule, and

(2) Suppose $B_1, \ldots, B_m \hookleftarrow A_1, \ldots, A_m \in \Pi$ and p_1 appears in B_j and p_2 appears in A_i and $i \neq j$. Then there is no path from p_1 to p_2 in the dependency graph $\mathcal{G}(\Pi)$. □

A VIC-program is said to be a VIC_m program when its VC-rule has the form $B_1, \ldots, B_m \hookleftarrow A_1, \ldots, A_m$.

Intuitively, the VIC condition requires that the choice of a vertex is completely independent, because (1) it cannot be forced by factors other than the diffusion process, and (2) it is not influenced by conflicting atoms. Note that the Labour-Tory example in Section 2 is a VIC_2 program.

Given a VIC_m program Π containing the vertex choice rule $b_1(X), \ldots, b_m(X) \hookleftarrow a_1(X), \ldots, a_m(X)$, and having dependency graph $\mathcal{G}(\Pi)$, we define m sets of predicates $Pred^1_\Pi, \ldots, Pred^m_\Pi$ of Π, such that each set $Pred^i_\Pi$ contains all the predicates obtained by a reverse visit (i.e with each edge inverted, e.g. edge (a, b) is considered as (b, a)) of $\mathcal{G}(\Pi)$ starting from the predicate b_i. Moreover, given a state S, we can divide the induced ground VIC program Π_S into m independent programs $\Pi^1_S, \ldots, \Pi^m_S$, where each Π^m_S contains all rules from Π_S involving only predicates from $Pred^i_{\Pi_S}$.

Example 14. *Let* Π *be the* VIC_2 *program shown in Section 2. We have two sets of predicates, i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} Pred^L_\Pi = \{ \; & voteLabour^U, voteLabour^D, suptBrown, knows, \\ & mentor, student, olderRel\} \\ Pred^T_\Pi = \{ \; & voteTory^U, voteTory^U, likeCam, mentor, \\ & employee, idol, young\} \end{aligned}$$

Since the vertex choice rule is

$$voteTory^D(X), voteLabour^D(X) \hookleftarrow voteTory^U(X), voteLabour^U(X)$$

we have that $Q = \{1, 2\}$*, where* 1 *is associated with the choice voteTory, while* 2 *is associated with the choice voteLabour. Consider the state* S *where the choice for player* A *is* $S(A) = 1$ *(voteTory), while the choice for player* B *is* $S(B) = 2$

(voteLabour). Then the programs Π_S^L *and* Π_S^T *are*

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_S^L: \; voteLabour^U(A):X &\leftarrow suptBrown(A):X\\
voteLabour^U(B):X &\leftarrow voteLabour^D(A):X,\ knows(B,A):1\\
voteLabour^U(B):X &\leftarrow voteLabour^D(A):X,\ mentor(B,A):1,\\
&\qquad\quad student(B):1\\
voteLabour^U(B):X &\leftarrow voteLabour^D(A):X,\ olderRel(B,A):1\\
voteLabour^D(B) &\leftarrow voteLabour^U(B)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi_S^T: \quad voteTory^U(A):X &\leftarrow likeCam(A):X\\
voteTory^U(B):X &\leftarrow voteTory^D(A):X,\ mentor(B,A):1,\\
&\qquad\quad employee(B):1\\
voteTory^U(B):X &\leftarrow voteTory^D(A):X,\ idol(B,A):1,\\
&\qquad\quad young(B):1\\
voteTory^D(A) &\leftarrow voteTory^U(A)
\end{aligned}$$

□

The following result shows some properties of VIC programs.

PROPOSITION 8.3. *Given two states* S_1 *and* S_2 *of a VIC program* Π*, where* S_2 *only differs from* S_1 *in the choice of player* p*, i.e.* $S_1(p') = S_2(p')$ *if* $p' \neq p$*, and* $S_1(p') \neq S_2(p')$ *if* $p' = p$*, then for each player* $\hat{p} \in \Gamma_\Pi$ *the following statements hold:*

1. $u(S_1, \hat{p}, S_1(p)) \geq u(S_2, \hat{p}, S_1(p))$.
2. $u(S_1, \hat{p}, S_2(p)) \leq u(S_2, \hat{p}, S_2(p))$.
3. $\forall j \in Q \setminus \{S_1(p), S_2(p)\}: \quad u(S_1, \hat{p}, j) = u(S_2, \hat{p}, j)$. □

Example 15 below shows that VIC programs are not guaranteed to have strong equilibria.

EXAMPLE 15. *Consider the following VIC program where the size of vertex choice rule is* 3*.*

$$\begin{aligned}
g^U(1):0.4 &\leftarrow\\
r^U(2):0.4 &\leftarrow\\
b^U(3):0.4 &\leftarrow
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
b^U(1):1.0 &\leftarrow b^D(3):0.2\\
g^U(2):1.0 &\leftarrow g^D(1):0.2\\
r^U(3):1.0 &\leftarrow r^D(2):0.2
\end{aligned}$$

$$g^D(X), r^D(X), b^D(X) \hookleftarrow g^U(X), r^U(X), b^U(X)$$

This program does not have any strong equilibrium. Moreover, observe that if we remove any one of the facts, three strong equilibria exist.

The following result shows that the problem of checking existence of a strong equilibrium for VIC_3 programs is NP-hard.

THEOREM 8.4 EXISTENCE OF STRONG EQUILIBRIUM FOR VIC_3 PROGRAMS. *Given a VIC* cGAP *program* Π *where the size of vertex choice rule is* 3*, the problem of deciding whether* Π *has a strong equilibrium is still* **NP***-hard under data and combined complexity.* □

Algorithm 4 Algorithm finding a strong equilibrium.

```
1: procedure findSE(cGAP VIC_2 program Π)
2:     Let S be a state s.t. S(P_v) = 1 for all players P_v ∈ Γ_Π;
3:     while (S does not represent a strong equilibrium for Π) do
4:         for all (players P_v s.t. u(S, P_v, 1) < u(S, P_v, 2)) do
5:             Set S(P_v) = 2;
6:         end for
7:     end while
8: return MM(Π_S)
9: end procedure
```

The following result shows that for VIC programs, all Nash equilibria are strong equilibria, but the converse is not necessarily true.

THEOREM 8.5. *Let* Π *be a VIC program. Then every Nash equilibrium is a strong equilibrium for* Π*, but in general a strong equilibrium for* Π *may not be a Nash equilibrium.* □

8.1 VIC$_2$ Programs

Fortunately, VIC_2 programs have two nice properties. First, they are guaranteed to have a strong equilibrium. And second, the problem of finding a strong equilibrium can be solved in polynomial time.

Algorithm 4 shows how to find such a strong equilibrium. We use the concept of state defined in Section 5. We start (line 2) by creating an initial state where all players take action 1 (of the two actions $1, 2$ supported by the VIC_2 program). Recall that for each player $\mathcal{P}_v$, we have only two choices in VIC_2 programs, i.e. $Q(\mathcal{P}_v) = \{1, 2\}$. If this state is not a strong equilibrium, we identify all players for which a higher utility is obtained by performing action 2 (lines $3 - 7$) and if this is the case, we set their action appropriately. Finally (line 8), we return the minimal model of the induced ground GAP Π_S (see Definition 5.1).

Observe that a different strong equilibrium can be found by inverting action 1 with 2 and vice versa.

THEOREM 8.6. *Algorithm 4 runs in* **PTIME** *and returns a strong equilibrium (that always exists).* □

From the set of all ground atoms of a VIC_2 program Π, we can define two sets: $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_S^1)$ is the set of all actions in $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_S)$ atoms linked with the action 1 — $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_S^2)$ is the set of all actions in $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_S)$ atoms linked with the action. Let S_{12} (S_{21}) be the state identifying the strong equilibrium computed by Algorithm 4 (resp. by inverting the action 1 with 2 and vice versa). The following result shows certain relationships about the utilities returned by the different minimal models of GAPs depending upon our choice of S.

THEOREM 8.7 MAXIMAL AND MINIMAL MODELS. *Suppose* Π *is a* VIC_2 *program. For each state* S *identifying a strong equilibrium the following statements hold:*

1. $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{12}}^2) \preceq \mathcal{MM}(\Pi_S^2) \preceq \mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{21}}^2)$

2. $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi^1_{S_{21}}) \preceq \mathcal{MM}(\Pi^1_S) \preceq \mathcal{MM}(\Pi^1_{S_{12}})$ □

The following result shows that checking whether an action is true in all strong equilibria is polynomially solvable in the case of VIC_2 programs.

PROPOSITION 8.8 ENTAILMENT IN VIC_2 . *Given a* VIC_2 *program* Π *and a ground annotated atom* AA*, the problem of deciding whether* $\Pi \models AA$ *is in* **PTIME** *under data and combined complexity.* □

The result below, however, states that checking for existence of strong equilibria different from $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{21}})$ and $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{12}})$ is still computationally intractable.

THEOREM 8.9. *The problem of deciding whether there exists a strong equilibrium* M *different from* $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{21}})$ *and* $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{12}})$ *is* **NP***-hard under data and combined complexity.* □

The following result shows complexity results for counting problems associated with VIC_2 programs.

THEOREM 8.10.

—*Given a* VIC_2 *program* Π*, the problem of counting the number of strong equilibria is* #**P***-hard under data and combined complexity.*

—*Given a positive integer* k *and* VIC_2 *program* Π*, the problem of deciding whether* Π *has at least* k *strong equilibria is* **PP***-hard.* □

At this point, since the number of strong equilibria for a VIC_2 program can be exponential, the question is whether it is possible to enumerate all the strong equilibria by using a polynomial total time algorithm. We recall that an algorithm generating all configurations that satisfy a given specification is said to be *polynomial total time* [Johnson et al. 1988] if the time required to output all configurations is bounded by a polynomial in n (the size of the input) and C (the number of configurations). Unfortunately, as stated in Proposition 8.11, this is not possible unless $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$.

PROPOSITION 8.11. *If there exists a polynomial-time algorithm for generating all the strong equilibria of a* VIC_2 *program, then* $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$*.* □

9. ESTIMATION QUERIES AND COMPETITIVE DIFFUSION

In this section, we look at the problem of estimating the diffusion of concepts when competing diffusions are involved. We view these as queries that we call "estimation queries".

Let Π be a $cGAP$ and $b_1(X), \ldots, b_m(X) \hookleftarrow a_1(X), \ldots, a_m(X)$ be its vertex choice rule. Then, for each atom $b_i(X)$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$, we have an additional *choice* atom $c_b_i(X)$, assuming a value in the (binary) set $\{0, 1\}$, specifying whether the player X chose the action b_i. Given an interpretation I, let $I(c_b_i(X)) = 1$ if player X chose action b_i — otherwise $I(c_b_i(X)) = 0$. We use $C(\Pi)$ to denote the set of all choice atoms $c_b_i(X)$. Choice atoms have been introduced in order to correctly compute queries involving estimated diffusion through the network.

Definition 9.1 *Estimation Query.* An estimation query (or just query for short) $\mathcal{Q}$ over a *cGAP* Π is a pair

$$\mathcal{Q} = \langle f(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n), \{A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n\}\rangle$$

where $f(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n)$ is a generic function computable in PTIME, and $\{A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n\}$ is a collection of ground atoms of $\Pi \cup C(\Pi)$.

Intuitively, this estimation query takes as input, a set $\{A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n\}$ of ground annotated atoms and a function that aggregates the μ_i's together. The annotated atoms specify which annotated atoms are important in estimating some quantity, and the function f specifies how these annotations are to be merged together into a single annotation. The function f is often an aggregation function such as `sum`, `count`, etc. The following example provides an illustration of this concept.

EXAMPLE 16. *Consider the example about the Labour-Tory election presented in Section 2, and suppose we are interested in estimating the number of persons voting for Labour. This can be expressed as the estimation estimation query*

$$\mathcal{Q} = \langle \texttt{sum}(\mu), \{c_voteLabour^D(X) : \mu \mid X \in \texttt{V}\}\rangle$$

We use the function `sum` *instead of* `count` *since the value μ assumed by each of the atoms $c_voteLabour^D(X)$ can be only* 0 *or* 1. □

Let Π be a *cGAP*, and let $\mathcal{Q}$ be an estimation query over Π. We say that a value a is a *possible answer* to estimation query $\mathcal{Q}$ w.r.t. a *cGAP* Π if there is a strong equilibrium M for Π such that $f(M(A_1), \ldots, M(A_n)) = a$. We write $poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q})$ to denote the set of all possible answers of the estimation query $\mathcal{Q}$ over Π.

We consider the following semantics to the estimation query $\mathcal{Q}$ over Π.

Definition 9.2 *Range Answer.* The *range answer* is the interval

$$[L_{\mathcal{Q}}; U_{\mathcal{Q}}] = [\texttt{glb}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q})); \texttt{lub}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q}))]$$

where `glb` and `lub` stand, respectively, for greatest lower bound and least upper bound.

EXAMPLE 17. *Consider the VIC_2 cGAP Π of Example 6, where we have only two strong equilibria, namely SE_a and SE_b:*

	$buyAsus^U(1)$	$buyAsus^D(1)$	$buyMac^U(1)$	$buyMac^D(1)$
SE_a	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.0
SE_b	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.3

Suppose we want to know the confidence that vertex 1 *has in buying an Asus, i.e. our estimation estimation query is $\mathcal{Q} = \langle \texttt{sum}(\mu), \{buyAsus^D(1) : \mu\}\rangle$. We have that $poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q}) = \{0.3, 0.6\}$, and then $\texttt{glb}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q})) = 0.3$ and $\texttt{lub}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q})) = 0.6$. Thus, the range answer to the estimation query $\mathcal{Q}$ is the interval $[0.3, 0.6]$.*

By considering now the estimation query $\mathcal{Q}' = \langle 1 - \texttt{sum}(\mu), \{buyAsus^D(1) : \mu\}\rangle$ we have that the range answer is the interval $[0.4, 0.7]$. □

The following result says that the complexity of determining the range answer to an estimation query is intractable.

Algorithm 5 Naive range answer computation.

```
1: procedure rangeAns(cGAP Π, Q = ⟨f(μ_1, ..., μ_n), {A_1 : μ_1, ..., A_n : μ_n}⟩)
2:     Compute the set S_M of all coherent models by using Algorithm 1
3:     glb = −∞ lub = +∞
4:     for each M ∈ S_M do
5:         if M is a strong equilibrium then
6:             Let q be the result of computing Q over M
7:             if q > lub then lub = q
8:             end if
9:             if q < glb then glb = q
10:            end if
11:        end if
12:    end for
13:    return [glb, lub]
14: end procedure
```

THEOREM 9.3. *Given a* cGAP Π*, an estimation query* $\mathcal{Q}$ *over* Π *and a possible answer* a *of* $\mathcal{Q}$*, the problem of decide whether* $a = \texttt{glb}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q}))$ *(resp.* $a = \texttt{lub}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q}))$*) is in* **DP** *and co-*$\mathbf{NP}$*-hard.* □

Algorithm 5 shows a straightforward method to compute the range answer to an estimation query. However, by constructing an appropriate objective function for the MILP defined by constraints $ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T})$ from Section 7, it is possible to solve the entailment problem and compute the range answer for estimation queries where the function f is `sum`, `count`, `min`, or `max`. Even though `count`, `min` and `max` are not linear functions, the expressive power of our MILPs allow us to express them by adding other binary variables and constraints. In fact, using Type 1 constraints, where we have the binary variables u_i^t, for each rule $r_i \in rules(A)$, we are able to model the nonlinear constraint $x_A^t = \max_{r_i \in rules(A)} z_i^t$. This means that we can also handle *cGAP*s whose annotation functions are nonlinear.

9.1 Monotone estimation queries

In this section, we show an important result. The range answer to queries that are monotone (which include most things we would probably want to know with respect to diffusion in social networks including `sum`, `count`, `min`, or `max`) can be computed in polynomial time.

Definition 9.4 *Monotone estimation query.* An estimation query $\mathcal{Q} = \langle f(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n), A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n \rangle$ over a linear *cGAP* Π is *monotone* if, given two real vectors $\bar{x} = [x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ and $\bar{y} = [y_1, \ldots, y_n]$ s.t. $x_i \leq y_i$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we have that $f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \leq f(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$.

THEOREM 9.5. *Given a* cGAP Π*, a monotone estimation query* $\mathcal{Q}$ *over* Π *and a possible answer* a *of* $\mathcal{Q}$*, the problem of deciding whether* $a = \texttt{glb}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q}))$ *(resp.* $a = \texttt{lub}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q}))$*) is co-*$\mathbf{NP}$*-hard.* □

The above theorem says that finding the range answer to a monotone estimation query is computationally hard to compute. Fortunately, the next result suggests

that by considering specific interpretations, we can get lower and upper bounds on the range answer.

THEOREM 9.6. *Let* Π *be a VIC*$_2$ *program and let* $\mathcal{Q} = \langle f(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n), A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n \rangle$ *be a monotone estimation query over* Π. *Then,*

1. $f(I(A_1), \ldots, I(A_n)) \leq \texttt{glb}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q}))$, *where* $I = \mathcal{MM}(\Pi^1_{S_{21}} \cup \Pi^2_{S_{12}})$;
2. $\texttt{lub}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q})) \leq f(I(A_1), \ldots, I(A_n))$, *where* $I = \mathcal{MM}(\Pi^1_{S_{12}} \cup \Pi^2_{S_{21}})$. □

Note that the monotonicity of function f is necessary to prove Theorem 9.6 by using Theorem 8.7 (also see Example 18). The following result shows that range answers to monotone queries can be computed by looking at the minimal models of certain specific GAPs.

THEOREM 9.7. *Let* Π *be a VIC*$_2$ *program and let* $\mathcal{Q} = \langle f(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n), A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n \rangle$ *be a monotone estimation query over* Π. *Let* $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ *be the predicate symbols appearing in atoms* $A_1, \ldots, A_n$. *If* $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \subseteq Pred^1_\Pi$ *(resp.* $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \subseteq Pred^2_\Pi$*), then*

—$\texttt{glb}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q})) = f(I(A_1), \ldots, I(A_n))$, *where* $I = \mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{21}})$ *(resp.* $I = \mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{12}})$*);*

—$\texttt{lub}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q})) = f(I(A_1), \ldots, I(A_n))$, *where* $I = \mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{12}})$ *(resp.* $I = \mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{21}})$*).* □

EXAMPLE 18. *Consider the situation of Example 17 and assume that buyAsus is choice* 1, *while buyMac is choice* 2. *Then,* $SE_a = \mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{12}})$ *and* $SE_b = \mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{21}})$. *By considering the monotone estimation query* $\mathcal{Q} = \langle \texttt{sum}(\mu), \{buyAsus^D(1) : \mu\} \rangle$ *we have that* $\texttt{glb}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q})) = SE_b(buyAsus^D) = 0.3$ *and* $\texttt{lub}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q})) = SE_a(buyAsus^D) = 0.6$, *and this coincide with the range answer to* $\mathcal{Q}$.

If we now consider the non-monotone estimation query $\mathcal{Q}' = \langle 1 - \texttt{sum}(\mu), \{buyAsus^D(1) : \mu\} \rangle$, *we have that* $\texttt{glb}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q})) \neq 1 - SE_b(buyAsus^D) = 0.7$ *and* $\texttt{lub}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q})) \neq 1 - SE_a(buyAsus^D) = 0.4$. □

The following result shows that range answers for monotone queries can be computed in polynomial time. In fact, Theorem 9.7 tells us that the range answer can be computed by just using the strong equilibria $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{21}})$ and $\mathcal{MM}(\Pi_{S_{12}})$, and these strong equilibria can be computed in PTIME as shown in Theorem 8.6.

COROLLARY 9.8. *Let* Π *be a VIC*$_2$ *program and let* $\mathcal{Q} = \langle f(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n), A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n \rangle$ *be a monotone estimation query over* Π. *Let* $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ *be the predicate symbols appearing in atoms* $A_1, \ldots, A_n$. *If* $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \subseteq Pred^1_\Pi$ *(resp.* $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\} \subseteq Pred^2_\Pi$*), then computing the range semantics is in PTIME.*

9.2 Linear Queries

In this section, we focus on linear queries. These queries can be computed on linear cGAPs which are not necessarily VIC programs. Moreover, linear queries can express monotone queries such as `sum` and `count`.

Definition 9.9. An estimation query $\mathcal{Q} = \langle f(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n), A_1 : \mu_1, \ldots, A_n : \mu_n \rangle$ over a linear *cGAP* Π is *linear* if the function $f(\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n)$ is computable in PTIME and

—f is expressed by a linear function $k + c_1^T \bar{x} + c_2^T \bar{y}$, where $\bar{x} = [x_{A_1}, \ldots, x_{A_n}]$ is the vector of variables associated with $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_n$, $\bar{y} = [y_1, \ldots, y_m]$ is a vector of $m \leq pol(n)$ real or integer variables, k is a constant, and c_1 and c_2 are vectors of constants.

—$\hat{x}$ and $\hat{y}$ are constrained by a set of linear constraints C_f of size $pol(n)$, i.e. $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in C_f$.

THEOREM 9.10. *Given a* cGAP Π*, a linear estimation query* $\mathcal{Q}$ *over* Π *and a possible answer* a *of* $\mathcal{Q}$*, the problem of deciding whether* $a = \texttt{glb}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q}))$ *(resp.* $a = \texttt{lub}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q}))$*) is co-***NP***-hard.* □

The following result shows that linear queries can be computed by solving a mixed integer linear program.

PROPOSITION 9.11. *Let* Π *be a linear* cGAP *and* $\mathcal{Q}$ *a linear estimation query over* Π*, then* $\texttt{glb}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q}))$ *is equal to*

$$\begin{aligned} &\min\ k + c_1^T \bar{x} + c_2^T \bar{y} \\ &\textbf{subject to} \\ &\qquad (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in C_f \\ &\qquad \hat{x} \in ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T}) \end{aligned}$$

and $\texttt{lub}(poss(\Pi, \mathcal{Q}))$ *is equal to*

$$\begin{aligned} &\max\ k + c_1^T \bar{x} + c_2^T \bar{y} \\ &\textbf{subject to} \\ &\qquad (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) \in C_f \\ &\qquad \hat{x} \in ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T}) \end{aligned}$$

□

EXAMPLE 19. *Consider the cGAP* Π *of Example 9 — its corresponding set* $ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T})$ *of constraints is described in Examples 10-13. Let* $\mathcal{Q}_1 = \langle \mu_1 - \mu_2, \{b_1 : \mu_1, b_2 : \mu_2\} \rangle$ *be an estimation estimation query. Then, the greatest lower bound is computed using the following MILP:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\min\ x_{b_1} - x_{b_2} \\ &s.t. \\ &\qquad \{x_{b_1}, x_{b_2}\} \in ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T}). \end{aligned}$$

To compute the least upper bound, it is sufficient to change the objective function to $\max\ x_{b_1} - x_{b_2}$*.*

Moreover, we can express a count estimation query over the individuals that make a specific choice by considering the choice *atoms, i.e. the atoms indicating that a player makes a particular choice, and setting the objective function to be the sum of all the associated variables.*

As an other example, consider the estimation query $\mathcal{Q}_2 = \langle \texttt{min}(\mu_1, \mu_2), \{b_1 : \mu_1, b_2 : \mu_2\} \rangle$*. In this case, the greatest lower bound is computed with the following*

MILP:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\min\ y_2 \\
&\textbf{subject to} \\
&\quad x_{b_1} + y_1 \geq y_2 \\
&\quad x_{b_1} \leq y_2 \\
&\quad x_{b_2} + (1 - y_1) \geq y_2 \\
&\quad x_{b_2} \leq y_2 \\
&\quad y_1 \in 0, 1 \\
&\quad y_2 \in [0, 1] \\
&\quad \{x_{b_1}, x_{b_2}\} \in ILC(\Pi, \widehat{T}).
\end{aligned}
$$

The least upper bound is computed by changing the objective function to $\max\ y_2$. *The* `max` *aggregate operator can be expressed similarly as* `min`. □

10. EXPERIMENTS

We ran experiments to check the scalability and accuracy of our framework in predicting real-world election outcomes by considering *Facebook* discussions surrounding the 2013 Italian general election. All experiments were run on an Intel I7 2.70 GHz machine with 8 GB RAM.

Dataset. We used a dataset extracted from *Facebook*. The dataset contains information about Italian Facebook users and their Facebook friends, together with all Facebook pages that each user likes. For each Facebook *like* we store the page url, name and type (e.g. Actor/Director, Public Figure, Community, Political Organization, etc.). The dataset contains about 65 000 users, 84 000 friendship relations, and 520 000 likes. The exact statistics are reported in Figure 1.

As our dataset was extracted after the elections, it contains a lot of user preferences about the political parties and/or politicians involved in the electoral competition, expressed in terms of likes of pages maintained by political parties and/or politicians. There were three main political forces or alliances involved in the election competition, denoted by p_1, p_2 and p_3.

For each user u in our Facebook dataset and for each party p_i who participated in the elections, we assigned a confidence value $\rho(u, p_i) \in [0, 1]$, $1 \leq i \leq 3$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{3} \rho(u, p_i) = 1$, that expresses how much the user u likes the party p, as follows.

—First of all, we classified the Facebook pages of type Political Organization or Politician contained in the dataset (1002 pages) into three categories, p_1, p_2 and p_3, according to the content of the page.

—Second, for each user u and for each party p_i we counted how many Facebook pages of type p_i she/he likes (we denote this value as $\#likes(u, p_i)$).

—Third, the value $\rho(u, p_i)$ is then computed as $\rho(u, p_i) = \frac{\#likes(u,p_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^{3} \#likes(u,p_i)}$.

—Finally, we classified a user u as *supporter* of the party p_i, if p_i corresponds to the maximum coefficient $\rho(u, p_i)$.

In our experiments we considered 4 competitions:

(1) p_2 vs. p_3;

(2) p_2 and p_3 vs. p_1;

Facebook dataset	
Vertices	64889
Edges (Undirected)	83752
Vertices in largest WCC	64889 (1.0)
Edges in largest WCC	83752 (1.0)
Average degree	2.58
Density	$3.98\,10^{-5}$
Average clustering coefficient	0.465
Number of triangles	33857
Diameter (longest shortest path)	4

Fig. 1: Facebook network statistics.

(3) p_2 vs. p_1;
(4) p_3 vs. p_1;

For each competition, we constructed 20 (training set, validation set) pairs of data to use in the experiments. We did this as follows: given the set U of users having at least one *like* to a page of type Political Organization or Politician (a total of 1 439 users), and a value $\delta \in [0, 100]$, we randomly select $\delta\%$ of the users in U to be part of the training set, while the remaining $(1-\delta)\%$ of users are part of the validation set. We used 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70 and 80 as values for δ. Of course, our algorithm is then executed over the whole network (65K users).

Diffusion models. We used three different diffusion models in our experiments, The first diffusion model is a kind of cascade model in which the likelihood of a vertex adopting a political preference is the average of the likelihoods of its friends adopting that position.

$$model_1: \begin{array}{l} choice1(v): \frac{1}{|nbr(v)|}\sum_{u\in nbr(v)}\mu_u \leftarrow \bigwedge_{u\in nbr(v)} choice1(u):\mu_u. \\ choice2(v): \frac{1}{|nbr(v)|}\sum_{u\in nbr(v)}\mu_u \leftarrow \bigwedge_{u\in nbr(v)} choice2(u):\mu_u. \end{array}$$

In the second diffusion model, the likelihood of a vertex adopting a political preference is proportional to the maximal likelihood of one of its friends adopting the same position.

$$model_2: \begin{array}{l} choice1(v): \max_{u\in nbr(v)}\mu_u \leftarrow \bigwedge_{u\in nbr(v)} choice1(u):\mu_u. \\ choice2(v): \max_{u\in nbr(v)}\mu_u \leftarrow \bigwedge_{u\in nbr(v)} choice2(u):\mu_u. \end{array}$$

The third diffusion model used in our experiments is a tipping model [Granovetter 1973; Schelling 1978]. It checks to see if the sum of the likelihoods of the friends of a vertex adopting a particular political preference exceeds a threshold τ (the tipping point). If so, the likelihood of the vertex adopting the same political preference is the likelihood of the neighbor having the strongest political preference.

$$model_3: \begin{array}{l} choice1(v): \max_{u\in nbr(v)}\mu_u \leftarrow \bigwedge_{u\in nbr(v)} choice1(u):\mu_u \wedge \\ \qquad\qquad \wedge \sum_{u\in nbr(v)}\mu_u \geq \tau. \\ choice2(v): \max_{u\in nbr(v)}\mu_u \leftarrow \bigwedge_{u\in nbr(v)} choice2(u):\mu_u \wedge \\ \qquad\qquad \wedge \sum_{u\in nbr(v)}\mu_u \geq \tau. \end{array}$$



Fig. 2: Average AUROC (y-axis) as we vary the size of the training set (x-axis) from 20% to 80% of the entire Facebook data set.



Fig. 3: Standard deviation of AUROC (y-axis) as we vary the size of the training set (x-axis) from 20% to 80% of the entire Facebook data set.

For each competition-diffusion model pair, we computed the maximal model (M_1) and the minimal model (M_2) using Algorithm 4. We assigned real utility values to users in the training set, while users in the validation set were assigned a 0 utility value (because we will use our model to predict which of the two political orientations these users prefer). The real utility values are computed by taking into account the values $\rho(u, p_i)$. For instance, for the second competition the utility of vertex u for p_2 and p_3 is $u_1(u) = \frac{\rho(u,p_2)+\rho(u,p_3)}{\rho(u,p_1)+\rho(u,p_2)+\rho(u,p_3)}$, while the utility of u for p_1 is $u_2(u) = \frac{\rho(u,p_1)}{\rho(u,p_1)+\rho(u,p_2)+\rho(u,p_3)}$.

Area under the ROC curve. In order to evaluate our model, we built a threshold classifier by using bounds over the vertices' utility values returned by the models M_1 and M_2. For each vertex i, we have a lower bound $L_1(i)$ (resp. $L_2(i)$) and an upper bound $U_1(i)$ (resp. $U_2(i)$) over the utility of choice 1 (resp. choice 2) for vertex i. For each vertex i we computed the value $f(i) = \frac{L_1(i)+U_1(i)}{2} - \frac{L_2(i)+U_2(i)}{2}$. The first term denotes the utility of preference 1 (choice 1) for vertex i, computed as the average of the lower and upper bound estimates of that utility. The second term represents the same concept for the second choice. $f(i)$ captures the difference between these utilities. When this difference exceeds a given threshold τ, the vertex i goes with the first choice of political party. If not, it goes with the second choice.

We computed the ROC curve by varying the threshold τ, and used the area under the ROC curve to measure the accuracy of our model.

Figure 2 shows a graph of the average AUROC as we vary the size of the training set from 20% of the overall data set to 80% in steps of 10%. For each value of this size, we randomly selected a data set of that size from our Facebook data in 20 ways. Then, as mentioned above, another 4500 combinations of parameters were considered, making a total of 90,000 experimental settings for each data set size. We have a total of 8 data set sizes, making 720K runs in all in our experiments.

For each data set size, Figure 2 shows the average AUROC we derived. We see that on average, the AUROC varies between 0.75 and 0.78 which is quite a narrow band. Recall that an AUROC of 0.5 denotes random guessing and hence these AUROCs show strong predictive power. Moreover, the predictive power seems relatively flat as we vary the size of the training set from 20% to 80%, varying by just about 3 percentage points overall, which indicates that we can get good predictive accuracy even without large training sets.

Appendix A shows 9 tables that provide more detail, on a competition by competition level, of the experimental accuracy summarized in Figure 2. Each table corresponds to one way of assigning a diffusion model to how each of the two political preferences spreads, leading to $(3 \times 3) = 9$ tables in all. Each of these tables shows the diffusion models used for the spread of the two political preferences, as well as the AUROCs obtained with no perturbation at all. Each table shows these values for each of the 4 competitions as we vary the training set from 20 to 80% of the total Facebook data set.

Figure 3 shows the standard deviation of the AUROCs we obtained. This figure shows an important trend, namely that the standard deviation stays small, under 0.05, even as the size of the training set varies from 20% to 80%.

Table I reports, for each competition and for each training set, the max AUROC obtained, the corresponding diffusion model, and the running time. Observe that the AUROCs obtained are all good except in the case of the first competition. This one case is anomalous because amongst the users in the set U (i.e. having at least one like to a political party), the percentage of users supporting party p_2 (resp. p_3) is 44% (resp. 37%). However, each user $u \in U$ supporting p_3 has, on average, 59% of friends supporting p_2 and 16% supporting p_3. On the other hand, each user $u \in U$ supporting p_2 has, on average, 70% of friends supporting p_2 and just 6% supporting p_3. It follows that the users in U that actually support p_3 will be denoted as users supporting p_2 by the diffusion models.

Network perturbation. In order to ensure that our experimental results are robust to (edge) noise in the network, we perturbed all the best scenarios of our Facebook network shown in Table I in two ways.

Node Perturbation. We perturbed vertices by exchanging the utilities of the two possible choices that a vertex might make in the training set with probability p. For each case shown in Table I, we did this by varying $p \in \{$ 25%, 50%, 75%, 100% $\}$. The results are shown in Figure 4 (first column of plots). In general, for all the competitions we observe the same trend: increasing p yields a lower AUROC. This is because our framework infers the political orientation of all the vertices in the network starting from vertices which like at least one political party in the training set. If this initial knowledge is wrong, then the AUROC is lower than the case without vertex perturbation. If the premise is wrong, then so is the conclusion.

mod1	mod2	% Training set	Comp	AUROC	Time (ms)
2	3	20	1	0.572	26908
3	2	30	1	0.572	12276
3	3	40	1	0.559	27202
3	3	50	1	0.563	27089
1	3	60	1	0.572	9454
3	2	70	1	0.597	11720
3	3	80	1	0.577	27040
1	2	20	2	0.913	60823
1	2	30	2	0.894	58445
1	2	40	2	0.915	53038
1	2	50	2	0.925	54272
1	2	60	2	0.883	49449
1	1	70	2	0.897	44034
1	3	80	2	0.913	9331
1	3	20	4	0.927	9258
1	3	30	4	0.94	9421
1	3	40	4	0.925	9518
1	1	50	4	0.939	36696
1	1	60	4	0.942	35688
1	3	70	4	0.928	9401
2	2	80	4	0.949	35790
1	3	20	5	0.802	9219
1	3	30	5	0.782	9300
1	3	40	5	0.793	9681
1	3	50	5	0.805	9632
1	3	60	5	0.758	9577
1	3	70	5	0.799	9399
1	3	80	5	0.78	9527

Table I: Maximum AUROC per each competition and per each size of training set.

Edge Perturbation. The second method guesses a set GE of edges where $|GE|$ is a percentage p of the total number of edges in the graph. Think of GE as edges that are wrongly represented in the graph. If an edge in GE is in the graph, it must be removed. If an edge in GE is not in the graph, it is inserted into the graph. Here too, we perturbed all the cases shown in Table I with the following values of probability p: 25%, 50%, 75%, and 100%. An edge perturbation with p =100% means that the number of the edges is at most doubled. The results are shown on Figure 4 (second column of plots). In this case, our framework is robust to the noise introduced, since we can observe very low variations between the AUROCs in the perturbed cases and the ones without perturbation.

11. RELATED WORK

To the best of our knowledge, this paper presents the first game-theoretic framework for competitive diffusion which scales to large social networks and which has been proven to have high accuracy.

[Kempe et al. 2003] proposes a framework for diffusion which is less general than the one presented here. The authors study a different problem than that presented in this paper - namely the problem of identifying the"most influential vertices" in a network. [Kempe et al. 2003] does not address either competitive diffusion or scaling to large social networks. Moreover, all diffusion models considered by [Kempe et al. 2003] must all conform to a submodularity property. A key difference between the approach of [Kempe et al. 2003] and the frameworks here and in [Shakarian et al. 2013] is that [Kempe et al. 2003] does not consider different edge and vertex properties. Additionally, there are many diffusion models in which submodularity does not hold — a simple diffusion model is presented in [Shakarian et al. 2010] where submodularity does not hold - based on a property spreading via multiple diffusion rules. This argument easily applies for competitive diffusion models as well. It is important to note that [Kempe et al. 2003] is a generalization of many important models in economics and social science such as [Granovetter



Fig. 4: Network perturbation.

1978; Jackson and Yariv 2005; J. Goldenberg 2001] - which can be represented with our logic-programming based framework as we showed in [Shakarian et al. 2013].

[Kempe et al. 2003] is extended to a competive scenario in [Carnes et al. 2007]. However, [Carnes et al. 2007] only allows one competitor to actively diffuse while all others must be static. In our work, all competitors are active at the same time. They extend the independent cascade model, and propose two models describing how two technologies simultaneously diffuse over the network. In the first model

(distance based), the vertex u influences a vertex v if they are connected and their distance in the network is small. In the second model (wave propagation) a vertex copies the adoption of a neighboring vertex randomly chosen from the set of its neighbors that are closest to the seeds. They show that for the two proposed diffusion models the decision versions are NP-hard, and the corresponding influence functions are non-negative, monotone, and sub-modular. A small dataset (8K vertices, 461 connected components) was used for experiments. From a game-theoretic perspective, the paper found a best response to the first player's move in a Stackelberg game. In contrast, our work is applicable to any diffusion models, not just three, we prove a host of complexity results and algorithms that take various aggregate functions into account, and we do not require submodularity. We also test our algorithms on a much bigger data set.

[Kostka et al. 2008] provides a theoretical treatment of a problem similar to [Carnes et al. 2007] with respect to the spread of rumors. They addressed the problem as a 2-player-game where the players are the competitors or rumors (in contrast, in our case the players are the vertices). The first player starts by choosing its set of seeds, then the second player makes his choice of seeds (the two seeds sets are different). Rumors then propagate on the network according to specific propagation models. The payoff of a player is computed after the diffusion has terminated and equals the number of vertices that believes in the rumor corresponding to the player. They show that computing the optimal strategy for both players is NP-complete, as well as determining an approximated solution for the first player. They analyzed several heuristics and showed that being the first to decide is not always advantageous. Their framework did not include an implementation.

The well-known work of [Lieberman et al. 2005] in biology presents a competitive diffusion model that considers the spread of a mutant gene in a population. As the mutant gene is attempting to replace (and can be replaced) by "residents" - the model is essentially competitive. The authors view the propagation of the mutants and residents as a stochastic process - which is similar to the long-studied "Moran process" [Moran 1958] in evolutionary biology - a non-graphical model which their work generalizes. It is important to note that the model of [Lieberman et al. 2005] so far has not been used in real-world algorithms and applications, but rather has been used as a theoretical basis for drawing conclusions on *fixation probability* - the probability that a single mutant overtakes a population as time progresses indefinitely. Unlike this work, their model only has two competitors (mutants and residents), does not consider multiple edge labels, or vertex properties beyond mutant/resident. We also note that [Lieberman et al. 2005] has influenced work in statistical physics and interacting particle systems such as [Sood et al. 2008] that uses basically the same intuition - and differs from this work in the same manner as [Lieberman et al. 2005] does. In contrast to these efforts, we allow more than two competitors, allow vertices and edges to have property labels, and in addition, our framework of ChoiceGAPs allows us to express a huge variety of diffusion models whereas these other papers focus on just one type of diffusion model. We have also proved a suite of complexity results and implemented scalable algorithms that avoid costly Monte-Carlo style simulations typically used for such models (see [Raedt et al. 2007]).

[Broecheler et al. 2010] presented a logic-based competitive diffusion model in which they induced a probability distribution over the space of models of a annotated logic program and hypothesized that the most likely "model" was the one that was likely to happen in practice. This one model of the annotated logic program was used to make forecasts (e.g. if the model said more people would adopt choice 1 instead of choice 2, then that is what would happen). However, no accuracy results were presented. One flaw with this is that it is possible that the most probable model has probability 5% and suggests that more people would adopt choice 1, while the remaining models (carrying 95% probability of occurring) suggest they would adopt choice 2. Moreover, even on networks of under 10K vertices, the algorithm tooks many, many hours to compute. In contrast, the results of this paper show far greater scalability as well as strong accuracy results.

This paper builds upon our previous work [Shakarian et al. 2013] in which we laid out an annotated-logic programming framework for diffusion in networks. However, this paper differs in several key aspects. The approach in [Shakarian et al. 2013] does not consider competitive diffusion models. As a consequence, it utilizes a less expressive semantics than the combination of choice logic programs and annotated logic programs used in this paper. It contains no results on equilibria, and does not provide any accuracy results. Second, [Shakarian et al. 2013] addresses a different problem — that of determining which vertices in the network will cause a property to spread to a maximal extend (w.r.t. a complex aggregate). The problem considered here is determine how competing properties will diffuse.

The study of epidemiology is another important field where network diffusion has been intensively studied. In [Shakarian et al. 2010], we showed that the well-known SIR (*susceptible, infectious, removed*) model of disease spread [Anderson and May 1979] can be represented in our framework - the same intuitions can be used for other disease modes such as SIS, for example. Moreover, [Shakarian et al. 2013] shows that other well known diffusion models like the Jackson-Yariv tipping model for product adoption [Jackson and Yariv 2005], the cascade model that captures favoriting of photos on Flickr [Cha et al. 2009a], as well as homophilic models [Aral et al. 2009] can all be expressed within the notion of a GAP. As ChoiceGAPs extend GAPs, they can also be expressed within the ChoiceGAP paradigm presented in this paper.

Further works about annotation and probabilistic logic can be found in [Kifer and Lozinskii 1992; Swift and Warren 1994; Kern-Isberner and Lukasiewicz 2004; Lukasiewicz and Straccia 2009; Leach and Lu 1996; Lukasiewicz and Simari 2013; Lu 1996], while for other works about non-determinism and choice construct in deductive systems see [Saccà and Zaniolo 1991; 1997; Greco et al. 1995; Greco and Zaniolo 1998; Giannotti et al. 2001; Giannotti et al. 1991; Pedreschi and Ruggieri 2004].

12. CONCLUSION

In real world social networks, multiple diffusive phenomena are competing for the attention of the same individual. For instance, multiple competing Presidential candidates are competing for the attention of social network users. Likewise, multiple phone companies (e.g. AT& T, Verizon, Sprint) are competing for the attention

of social network users. Most past work (with a couple of exceptions noted earlier [Kostka et al. 2008; Broecheler et al. 2010; Apt and Simon 2013]) have focused on diffusion in a simple setting where only one phenomenon is diffusing at a time

In this paper, we take the problem of competing diffusions "head on". We provide a very general framework called ChoiceGAPs in which a mix of generalized annotated programs (GAPs) due to Kifer and Subrahmanian [Kifer and Subrahmanian 1992] are neatly combined with Choice Logic Programs due to Saccà and Zaniolo [Saccà and Zaniolo 1990]. ChoiceGAPs extend the work of [Shakarian et al. 2013] where no competition was allowed and a single diffusion was spreading. As GAPs were shown in [Shakarian et al. 2013] to be capable of expressing a range of diffusion models including a variety of tipping models, a variety of cascade models, the SIR model of disease spread, the Jackson-Yariv model for product diffusion, a popular Flickr diffusion model [Cha et al. 2009a] as well as homophilic models [Aral et al. 2009], the ChoiceGAP framework can express all such diffusion models.

Using ChoiceGAPs, we build a game-theoretic framework in which every social network user is considered to be a player — thus the resulting game consists of a very large number of players. We show that certain models of the resulting logic programs can be thought of as "strong equilibria" models and that these models have very nice properties, similar to Nash equilibria (whose direct use would require making some unrealistic assumptions). We prove a host of results on the problem of identifying the existence of such equilibria under a variety of settings, and provide algorithms to compute them (or determine they don't exist) that are provably sound and complete. Because finding such strong equilibria can be NP-hard, we identify a tractable class of $cGAP$s called VIC_2 programs that have two nice properties. First, strong equilibria are guaranteed to exist, and second, they are guaranteed to be computable in polynomial time. We also show that monotone and linear estimation queries can be polynomially computed. Hence, as the annotation functions in the heads of $cGAP$ rules are monotonic in the case of the Flickr diffusion model [Cha et al. 2009b], the Jackson-Yariv model[Jackson and Yariv 2005], and homophilic models [Aral et al. 2009], it is easy to see that these models all can be polynomially computed.

This important result allows us to implement the ChoiceGAP framework for realistic applications.

We round out the paper with a prototype implementation of the ChoiceGAP framework in which we consider a real-world competitive diffusion situation — the 2013 Italian election which involved 3 major competing parties (and candidates for Prime Minister). Using a data set that we extracted from Facebook, we show that our framework and algorithm works well in practice, seamlessly handling social networks with about 65K users and 85K edges. Our ability to predict the number of those who like various political parties, even with generic diffusion models from the literature, has an AUROC of 0.76 on average across all experiments done in this paper. Learning diffusion models is not the topic of this paper — but we suspect that with learned diffusion models, this AUROC would only go up.

Nonetheless, this work merely represents the tip of the iceberg. There is much additional work that can be done. For instance, it is possible that competitive diffusion is not completely exclusive. A person might say that he likes candidate

A's policy on immigration but likes candidate B's policies on jobs. In the case of phone choices, a person might actually own both an AT&T and a Verizon phone. This suggests that a more general version of competitive diffusion is a constrained choice diffusion where a person is constrained in the number of choices he makes. Another major challenge is that of scalability. Though reasoning about competitive diffusion with a 65K vertex network is an order of magnitude bigger than what we have seen in past work [Kempe et al. 2003], it is not yet scalable to real social networks which may have millions of users. A possible strategy to explore this scalability is to coarsen networks along the lines reported in [Purohit et al. 2014] which shows methods to scale influence maximization to networks with over 30M edges.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to ARO for funding this work under grants W911NF11103 and W911NF09102.

REFERENCES

Anderson, R. M. and May, R. M. 1979. Population biology of infectious diseases: Part I. *Nature 280,* 5721, 361.

Apt, K. R. and Simon, S. 2013. Social network games with obligatory product selection. In *GandALF*. 180–193.

Aral, S., Muchnik, L., and Sundararajan, A. 2009. Distinguishing influence-based contagion from homophily-driven diffusion in dynamic networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 106,* 51 (December), 21544–21549.

Bell, C., Nerode, A., Ng, R. T., and Subrahmanian, V. 1994. Mixed integer programming methods for computing nonmonotonic deductive databases. *Journal of the ACM (JACM) 41,* 6, 1178–1215.

Bell, C., Nerode, A., Ng, R. T., and Subrahmanian, V. 1996. Implementing deductive databases by mixed integer programming. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems (TODS) 21,* 2, 238–269.

Broecheler, M., Shakarian, P., and Subrahmanian, V. S. 2010. A scalable framework for modeling competitive diffusion in social networks. In *SocialCom/PASSAT*. 295–302.

Carnes, T., Nagarajan, C., Wild, S. M., and van Zuylen, A. 2007. Maximizing influence in a competitive social network: a follower's perspective. In *ICEC '07*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 351–360.

Cha, M., Mislove, A., and Gummadi, K. 2009a. A measurement-driven analysis of information propagation in the flickr social network. In *WWW*. 721–730.

Cha, M., Mislove, A., and Gummadi, K. P. 2009b. A Measurement-driven Analysis of Information Propagation in the Flickr Social Network. In *In Proceedings of the 18th International World Wide Web Conference (WWW'09)*. Madrid, Spain.

Giannotti, F., Pedreschi, D., Saccà, D., and Zaniolo, C. 1991. Non-determinism in deductive databases. In *DOOD*. 129–146.

Giannotti, F., Pedreschi, D., and Zaniolo, C. 2001. Semantics and expressive power of non-deterministic constructs in deductive databases. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci. 62,* 1, 15–42.

Granovetter, M. 1978. Threshold models of collective behavior. *The American Journal of Sociology 83,* 6, 1420–1443.

Granovetter, M. S. 1973. The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology 78,* 6, 1360–1380.

Greco, S., Saccà, D., and Zaniolo, C. 1995. DATALOG queries with stratified negation and choice: from P to d^P. In *Database Theory - ICDT'95, 5th International Conference, Prague, Czech Republic, January 11-13, 1995, Proceedings*. 82–96.

Greco, S. and Zaniolo, C. 1998. Greedy algorithms in datalog with choice and negation. In *Proceedings of the 1998 Joint International Conference and Symposium on Logic Programming, Manchester, UK, June 15-19, 1998*. 294–309.

Hethcote, H. W. 1976. Qualitative analyses of communicable disease models. *Mathematical Biosciences 28,* 3-4, 335 – 356.

J. Goldenberg, B. Libai, E. M. 2001. Talk of the network: A complex systems look at the underlying process of word-of-mouth. *Marketing Letters 12,* 3, 211.

Jackson, M. and Yariv, L. 2005. Diffusion on social networks. In *Economie Publique*. Vol. 16. 69–82.

Johnson, D. S., Papadimitriou, C. H., and Yannakakis, M. 1988. On generating all maximal independent sets. *Inf. Process. Lett. 27,* 3, 119–123.

Kempe, D., Kleinberg, J., and Tardos, E. 2003. Maximizing the spread of influence through a social network. In *Proceedings of KDD '03*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 137–146.

Kern-Isberner, G. and Lukasiewicz, T. 2004. Combining probabilistic logic programming with the power of maximum entropy. *Artif. Intell. 157,* 1-2, 139–202.

Kifer, M. and Lozinskii, E. L. 1992. A logic for reasoning with inconsistency. *J. Autom. Reasoning 9,* 2, 179–215.

Kifer, M. and Subrahmanian, V. 1992. Theory of generalized annotated logic programming and its applications. *J. Log. Program. 12,* 3&4, 335–367.

Kostka, J., Oswald, Y. A., and Wattenhofer, R. 2008. Word of mouth: Rumor dissemination in social networks. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science 5058*, 185–196.

Leach, S. M. and Lu, J. J. 1996. Query processing in annotated logic programming: Theory and implementation. *J. Intell. Inf. Syst. 6,* 1, 33–58.

Lieberman, E., Hauert, C., and Nowak, M. A. 2005. Evolutionary dynamics on graphs. *Nature 433,* 7023, 312–316.

Lu, J. J. 1996. Logic programming with signs and annotations. *J. Log. Comput. 6,* 6, 755–778.

Lukasiewicz, T. and Simari, G. I. 2013. Tractable probabilistic description logic programs. In *Advances in Probabilistic Databases for Uncertain Information Management*. 131–159.

Lukasiewicz, T. and Straccia, U. 2009. Description logic programs under probabilistic uncertainty and fuzzy vagueness. *Int. J. Approx. Reasoning 50,* 6, 837–853.

Moran, P. A. P. 1958. Random processes in genetics. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 54,* 01, 60–71.

Nash, J. F. 1950. Equilibrium points in n-person games. *36,* 1 (January), 48–49.

Pedreschi, D. and Ruggieri, S. 2004. Bounded nondeterminism of logic programs. *Ann. Math. Artif. Intell. 42,* 4, 313–343.

Purohit, M., Prakash, B. A., Kang, C., Zhang, Y., and Subrahmanian, V. S. 2014. Fast influence-based coarsening for large networks. In *The 20th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '14, New York, NY, USA - August 24 - 27, 2014*. 1296–1305.

Raedt, L. D., Kimmig, A., and Toivonen, H. 2007. Problog: A probabilistic prolog and its application in link discovery. In *IJCAI 2007, Proceedings of the 20th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Hyderabad, India, January 6-12, 2007*. 2462–2467.

Saccà, D. and Zaniolo, C. 1990. Stable models and non-determinism in logic programs with negation. In *PODS*. 205–217.

Saccà, D. and Zaniolo, C. 1991. Partial models and three-valued models in logic programs with negation. In *LPNMR*. 87–101.

Saccà, D. and Zaniolo, C. 1997. Deterministic and non-deterministic stable models. *J. Log. Comput. 7,* 5, 555–579.

Schelling, T. C. 1978. *Micromotives and Macrobehavior*. W.W. Norton and Co.

Shakarian, P., Broecheler, M., Subrahmanian, V. S., and Molinaro, C. 2013. Using generalized annotated programs to solve social network diffusion optimization problems. *ACM Trans. Comput. Log. 14,* 2, 10.

Shakarian, P., Subrahmanian, V., and Sapino, M. L. 2010. Using Generalized Annotated Programs to Solve Social Network Optimization Problems. *ICLP (to appear)*.

Sood, V., Antal, T., and Redner, S. 2008. Voter models on heterogeneous networks. *Physical Review E (Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics) 77,* 4, 041121.

Swift, T. and Warren, D. S. 1994. An abstract machine for SLG resolution: Definite programs. In *Logic Programming, Proceedings of the 1994 International Symposium, Ithaca, New York, USA, November 13-17, 1994*. 633–652.

A. DETAILED EXPERIMENTAL BREAKDOWN

mod1	mod2	% Training set	Comp	AUROC	Time (ms)
1	1	20	1	0.553	48239
1	1	30	1	0.549	41052
1	1	40	1	0.525	39886
1	1	50	1	0.525	42201
1	1	60	1	0.566	41203
1	1	70	1	0.574	39942
1	1	80	1	0.52	38657
1	1	20	2	0.895	44957
1	1	30	2	0.891	44725
1	1	40	2	0.897	43213
1	1	50	2	0.917	44665
1	1	60	2	0.88	41384
1	1	70	2	0.897	44034
1	1	80	2	0.912	40321
1	1	20	3	0.926	35758
1	1	30	3	0.938	38353
1	1	40	3	0.924	35286
1	1	50	3	0.939	36696
1	1	60	3	0.942	35688
1	1	70	3	0.927	34824
1	1	80	3	0.943	35621
1	1	20	4	0.799	39085
1	1	30	4	0.776	38115
1	1	40	4	0.784	36340
1	1	50	4	0.797	36592
1	1	60	4	0.754	35984
1	1	70	4	0.791	37878
1	1	80	4	0.777	36315

mod1	mod2	% Training set	Comp	AUROC	Time (ms)
2	2	20	1	0.546	46052
2	2	30	1	0.557	39867
2	2	40	1	0.541	39858
2	2	50	1	0.528	40248
2	2	60	1	0.555	38539
2	2	70	1	0.595	38242
2	2	80	1	0.518	36198
2	2	20	2	0.906	42596
2	2	30	2	0.872	41465
2	2	40	2	0.859	40342
2	2	50	2	0.897	41834
2	2	60	2	0.875	38450
2	2	70	2	0.879	41731
2	2	80	2	0.901	37916
2	2	20	3	0.892	40180
2	2	30	3	0.887	41103
2	2	40	3	0.912	36643
2	2	50	3	0.937	39429
2	2	60	3	0.917	37722
2	2	70	3	0.916	37944
2	2	80	3	0.949	35790
2	2	20	4	0.711	37118
2	2	30	4	0.724	38111
2	2	40	4	0.752	35863
2	2	50	4	0.784	37085
2	2	60	4	0.702	37529
2	2	70	4	0.753	39792
2	2	80	4	0.752	37351

mod1	mod2	% Training set	Comp	AUROC	Time (ms)
3	3	20	1	0.526	26896
3	3	30	1	0.558	27016
3	3	40	1	0.559	27202
3	3	50	1	0.563	27089
3	3	60	1	0.531	27041
3	3	70	1	0.554	26983
3	3	80	1	0.577	27040
3	3	20	2	0.678	26956
3	3	30	2	0.664	27059
3	3	40	2	0.64	27173
3	3	50	2	0.639	27104
3	3	60	2	0.612	27421
3	3	70	2	0.688	26999
3	3	80	2	0.631	26953
3	3	20	3	0.735	26951
3	3	30	3	0.68	27054
3	3	40	3	0.701	27112
3	3	50	3	0.723	27219
3	3	60	3	0.737	26901
3	3	70	3	0.719	26973
3	3	80	3	0.681	26978
3	3	20	4	0.666	26980
3	3	30	4	0.671	26932
3	3	40	4	0.681	27221
3	3	50	4	0.691	27216
3	3	60	4	0.662	27089
3	3	70	4	0.689	27020
3	3	80	4	0.699	27073

mod1	mod2	% Training set	Comp	AUROC	Time (ms)
1	2	20	1	0.57	59887
1	2	30	1	0.543	54270
1	2	40	1	0.532	51231
1	2	50	1	0.502	51748
1	2	60	1	0.553	48869
1	2	70	1	0.581	48208
1	2	80	1	0.505	44480
1	2	20	2	0.913	60823
1	2	30	2	0.894	58445
1	2	40	2	0.915	53038
1	2	50	2	0.925	54272
1	2	60	2	0.883	49449
1	2	70	2	0.892	53510
1	2	80	2	0.905	45854
1	2	20	3	0.925	55210
1	2	30	3	0.934	50355
1	2	40	3	0.925	46006
1	2	50	3	0.938	48730
1	2	60	3	0.939	47193
1	2	70	3	0.927	47459
1	2	80	3	0.948	43050
1	2	20	4	0.777	56007
1	2	30	4	0.768	54425
1	2	40	4	0.777	49342
1	2	50	4	0.801	50165
1	2	60	4	0.73	50183
1	2	70	4	0.773	55897
1	2	80	4	0.764	49472

mod1	mod2	% Training set	Comp	AUROC	Time (ms)
2	1	20	1	0.57	28224
2	1	30	1	0.543	27507
2	1	40	1	0.532	27992
2	1	50	1	0.502	28657
2	1	60	1	0.553	28987
2	1	70	1	0.581	29142
2	1	80	1	0.505	29956
2	1	20	2	0.908	27307
2	1	30	2	0.89	27655
2	1	40	2	0.907	27892
2	1	50	2	0.917	27811
2	1	60	2	0.88	29343
2	1	70	2	0.888	28694
2	1	80	2	0.902	30529
2	1	20	3	0.923	27011
2	1	30	3	0.936	27843
2	1	40	3	0.924	27659
2	1	50	3	0.934	27711
2	1	60	3	0.935	27715
2	1	70	3	0.912	27451
2	1	80	3	0.947	27945
2	1	20	4	0.777	27285
2	1	30	4	0.768	27341
2	1	40	4	0.777	27964
2	1	50	4	0.801	28070
2	1	60	4	0.73	28135
2	1	70	4	0.773	27540
2	1	80	4	0.764	28147

mod1	mod2	% Training set	Comp	AUROC	Time (ms)
3	1	20	1	0.534	27986
3	1	30	1	0.556	27479
3	1	40	1	0.547	28009
3	1	50	1	0.534	29044
3	1	60	1	0.559	31017
3	1	70	1	0.595	29976
3	1	80	1	0.562	33081
3	1	20	2	0.769	27458
3	1	30	2	0.703	28111
3	1	40	2	0.783	28059
3	1	50	2	0.757	27854
3	1	60	2	0.792	29617
3	1	70	2	0.845	28810
3	1	80	2	0.845	31435
3	1	20	3	0.785	27032
3	1	30	3	0.81	27178
3	1	40	3	0.831	27742
3	1	50	3	0.876	27645
3	1	60	3	0.779	27737
3	1	70	3	0.831	27478
3	1	80	3	0.84	28035
3	1	20	4	0.69	27143
3	1	30	4	0.735	27257
3	1	40	4	0.756	28155
3	1	50	4	0.787	28089
3	1	60	4	0.72	28012
3	1	70	4	0.771	27695
3	1	80	4	0.764	28079

mod1	mod2	% Training set	Comp	AUROC	Time (ms)
2	3	20	1	0.572	26908
2	3	30	1	0.546	27512
2	3	40	1	0.541	27206
2	3	50	1	0.508	27139
2	3	60	1	0.557	27412
2	3	70	1	0.591	26957
2	3	80	1	0.511	27141
2	3	20	2	0.909	26908
2	3	30	2	0.891	27089
2	3	40	2	0.904	27173
2	3	50	2	0.915	27125
2	3	60	2	0.88	27065
2	3	70	2	0.888	26989
2	3	80	2	0.901	26925
2	3	20	3	0.922	26984
2	3	30	3	0.936	27064
2	3	40	3	0.922	27153
2	3	50	3	0.935	27287
2	3	60	3	0.935	26959
2	3	70	3	0.91	26954
2	3	80	3	0.947	26973
2	3	20	4	0.776	26989
2	3	30	4	0.768	26972
2	3	40	4	0.779	27349
2	3	50	4	0.803	27583
2	3	60	4	0.73	27058
2	3	70	4	0.774	26963
2	3	80	4	0.768	27534

mod1	mod2	% Training set	Comp	AUROC	Time (ms)
1	3	20	1	0.557	11739
1	3	30	1	0.564	9714
1	3	40	1	0.534	9629
1	3	50	1	0.531	9693
1	3	60	1	0.572	9454
1	3	70	1	0.579	9977
1	3	80	1	0.527	9697
1	3	20	2	0.898	9403
1	3	30	2	0.893	9531
1	3	40	2	0.898	9573
1	3	50	2	0.917	9387
1	3	60	2	0.88	9617
1	3	70	2	0.896	9388
1	3	80	2	0.913	9331
1	3	20	3	0.927	9258
1	3	30	3	0.94	9421
1	3	40	3	0.925	9518
1	3	50	3	0.939	9660
1	3	60	3	0.941	9371
1	3	70	3	0.928	9401
1	3	80	3	0.943	9326
1	3	20	4	0.802	9219
1	3	30	4	0.782	9300
1	3	40	4	0.793	9681
1	3	50	4	0.805	9632
1	3	60	4	0.758	9577
1	3	70	4	0.799	9399
1	3	80	4	0.78	9527

mod1	mod2	% Training set	Comp	AUROC	Time (ms)
3	2	20	1	0.537	13838
3	2	30	1	0.572	12276
3	2	40	1	0.556	12266
3	2	50	1	0.545	12421
3	2	60	1	0.557	11861
3	2	70	1	0.597	11720
3	2	80	1	0.564	10992
3	2	20	2	0.871	13036
3	2	30	2	0.818	12823
3	2	40	2	0.858	13585
3	2	50	2	0.897	13735
3	2	60	2	0.84	13357
3	2	70	2	0.872	14152
3	2	80	2	0.884	11571
3	2	20	3	0.886	12856
3	2	30	3	0.865	13972
3	2	40	3	0.898	14313
3	2	50	3	0.932	15202
3	2	60	3	0.9	14936
3	2	70	3	0.919	15547
3	2	80	3	0.922	13825
3	2	20	4	0.734	14685
3	2	30	4	0.744	13716
3	2	40	4	0.766	13411
3	2	50	4	0.791	12101
3	2	60	4	0.72	12054
3	2	70	4	0.76	12297
3	2	80	4	0.774	11715